



LIBRARY of  
Seventh day Adventist  
**THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**  
TAKOMA PARK WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Edwardson Memorial Library



DEFENSE  
OF THE  
*Christian Sabbath.*

PART the FIRST.

In Answer to  
A TREATISE of Mr. *Thomas Bampfield*  
Pleading for  
**SATURDAY-SABBATH.**

The Second Edition.

BY  
**JOHN WALLIS, D.D.** And Professor of Geometry  
in the University of OXFORD.

Imprimatur,

**HEN. ALDRICH,**  
Vice-Can. Oxon.

Feb. 17. 2.  
1693. 5

OXFORD,  
Printed by *L. Lichfield*, And are to be Sold by *Thomas Bennet*,  
at the *Half-Moon* in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, London. 1693.

S.D.A. The S.D.A. Seminary

Takoma Park  
Washington 12, D.C.

102426

## ADVERTISEMENT.

**T**HE first Edition of this Discourse 1691 being all Dispersed, and scarce to be had since which time Mr. *Bampffield* hath published a Reply, to which there is a Rejoinder now in the Press: It is thought advisable to reprint this (with very little alteration) page for page as before, so as not to disorder the Citations.

Vault

BV

125

1635

1693

Her

# 3547460

# DISCOURSE

Concerning The

## Christian Sabbath.

SIR,

June 12. 1692.

**I** Had a while since a Book sent me by the Carrier (I know not well from whom) of Mr. *Thomas Bampffield*, which in the Title-Page, is said to be Printed for the Author — 1692. It is Concerning the *Sabbath*. Which he thinks should rather be Observed on what we call *Saturday*, than on what we call *Sunday*.

I should not, on this Account, give any Disturbance to the Peace or Practice of the Church where I live, so that a Sabbath be duly Observed as to the *Substantials* of it, though perhaps not upon what day I should chuse.

For I do not know, and I believe no man living can tell me, whether what we now call *Sunday*, be a *First*, a *Second*, a *Third*, or a *Seventh* day, in a continued Circulation of *Weeks* from the *Creation*. And what it is impossible for me to know, I think will be no Crime to be Ignorant of. Nor hath this Author any other way than common *Tradition*, (on which he is not willing that we should lay weight,) whereby to guess, which is the *First*, or which is the *Seventh* day, in such a Circulation of *Weeks*, either from the *Creation*, or even from *Christ's Time*.

I am sufficiently satisfied that we ought to keep a *Sabbath*, that is, a day of *Holy Rest*, after *Six days of ordinary Labour*, according to the *Fourth Commandment*: and this in a continued Course or Circulation: But I am not certain, nor can I be, which

A

is

is a First, or a Seventh day in such a Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And therefore shall content my self to observe that day which I find observed in the Church where I live. In *Old England* I observe the Sabbath which here I find; And if I were in *New-England*, I would observe the Sabbath which I find observed there. Though I think it may be disputable whether they and we may be said to observe the same day, (the First Meridian passing between them and us.) And yet I would not advise to have it changed in either.

Now I can hardly think, that God hath laid the great stresses of so weighty a Point (as whereon the main of Gods publick Worship doth much depend) on such a Circumstance as is impossible for us to know, and of which we may be modestly ignorant.

I should rather think that what Christ says of the Place, *Joh. 4. 21, 23. The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this Mountain nor in Jerusalem worship the Father, but the true worshipers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth*, is in good measure true of the Time also; And, as it is not so material whether in this or that Place, God be Worshiped, so he be *Worshiped Aright*: so neither is it so material, whether on this or that day; as, that a Sabbath or day of *Holy Rest* be duly kept. The publick Worship of God, was then in great measure confined to the Temple; not indifferently, in any place within thy Gates, but in the place which the Lord thy God shall chuse, to put his name there, *Deut. 16. 6, 11, 15, 16.* For which any other place may now be as well assigned; that men pray every where lifting up holy hands, &c. *1 Tim. 2. 8.* (Privately in private places, and Publickly in places appointed for the publick.) And I do not think we are now more confined to the Jewish Sabbath, than to the Jewish Temple.

This premised, I can agree with this Author in many things by him discussed.

I agree, that *Our Lord Jesus Christ* (according to his Divinity) was God (and is so) the true God, the God that made Heaven and Earth, the God who delivered the Law upon Mount Sinai. For though we do acknowledge, in the Godhead, a Trinity of Persons; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, (whereof Christ according to his Divinity is called the Second Person, the Son of God, or God the Son,) yet those Three Persons are but One God. Nor do I know any other true God but One, The God that made Heaven and Earth, The Lord Jehovah, The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, The Lord God of Israel. The Lord their God who brought them out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage, and besides whom we are to have

no

no Other God, The God who delivered the Law to them on Mount Sinai; And I do agree that *Our Lord Jesus Christ*, is (as to his Divinity) this God, the True God, the only true God, and that he was so before his Incarnation. How far each of those Actions are to be ascribed to this or that Person of the Trinity, we need not be over solicitous. What in the New Testament is more peculiarly ascribed to this or that of the Three Persons, is in the Old Testament wont to be ascribed to God indefinitely, without such particular application; the doctrine of the Trinity being then not so distinctly discovered. But I cannot agree that Christ as God and Man (in contradistinction to the Father and Holy Ghost) did all those things, for he was not then Man.

I agree with him also, that God who made the World in Six days, Rested the Seventh day, *Gen. 2. 2, 3. Exod. 20. 11.* And that he Blessed the Sabbath day and Hallowed it. And that accordingly he hath appointed after Six days of ordinary Labour, Man should observe a Seventh day of Holy Rest, and this in a continued succession.

But I should rather say, that *our Lord Jesus Christ* is (according to his Divinity) that God who Blessed the Seventh day *Gen. 2.* than, that the God who Blessed the Sabbath day, is the Lord Jesus Christ; (as he doth p. 64. and elsewhere very often, seeming to lay great stress upon it.) For he was not then the Lord Christ (God and Man) nor did he bless it as Christ, but as God; in Union with the Father and Holy Ghost, not as contradistinguished from them.

I agree also, that the Law of the Sabbath is one of the Decalogue or Ten Commandments delivered to Israel on Mount Sinai. *Ex. 20.*

But I am willing to think it was a Law before. Not only because we find it observed, *Exod. 16.* (before the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, *Ex. 20.*) but especially because of that in *Gen. 2. 3. God blessed the Seventh day and Sanctified it, because in it he rested from all his Work.* And those who are most averse to the Morality (as it is wont to be called) or the Perpetuity of the Sabbath, or Day of Holy Rest, and are yet very zealous for the Holiness of Places, would be very fond of it if they could find so clear a Testimony, and so ancient, for the holiness of Place, as here is for that of Time.

I agree also that the Law of the Decalogue or Ten Commandments, though then given peculiarly to Israel, is Obligatory to Us also. For though some Clauses therein do peculiarly respect them; as that *who brought thee out of the land of Egypt out of the house*

A 2

house

house of bondage, and that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, (which I think is there said with a particular respect to the land of Canaan, which God gave to Israel, not to us;) yet the Body of that Law and the preceptive part of it, I take to be Obligatory to others also, and to Us in particular; the Decalogue being *Declarative* of what was (I think) a Law before (however neglected or forgotten,) and is by Christ and his Apostles frequently cited as such, even to Gentiles as well as Jews.

Nor will I dispute it with him, whether the Sabbath were observed from the Creation to the Flood. For I am willing to think that if it were not, it should have been; though, in the short History that Moses gives us of that time, there be no mention made of such observation. But I doubt it was not *universally* so observed, if at all. For when *all flesh had corrupted their ways*, I doubt the Sabbath day and the Worship of that day were by them not much regarded. Nor do I find (*Gen. 2. 3.*) any express Command (such as he demands for the First days Sabbath) that it should be observed thenceforth by Men, *every Seventh day of the Week for ever*. How far the words *he blessed and sanctified it* may extend I will not dispute. It may be a strong Intimation (and I think it is,) But it is not expressly said, that, *All Mankind must, for ever after, observe every Seventh day, in every Week, of days, reckoned continually from the first Creation*. Nor do I think it necessary to have been so recorded by Moses, (any more, than the Law for Sacrifices,) if it did otherwise appear to have been the Will of God. And therefore I would not have him lay too great a stress, on what he saith, that *there is no express Commandment Recorded in the New Testament, for observing the First day*: It is enough if we there find sufficient Intimation for us to judge that God was pleased to have it observed.

I say the like as to the time from the Flood to that of Abraham, and from thence to the coming of Israel out of Egypt. For I do not find any mention of their observing a Sabbath (either in the Writings of Moses, or the Book of Job) earlier than that of *Exod. 16.* after Israel's coming out of Egypt, and after the time that God is said to have made a statute and ordinance for them at Marah, *Ex. 15. 25.* What that Statute and Ordinance was, we cannot tell. The Jewish Writers think (or some of them) that it was that of the Sabbath; and perhaps it might, or this be some part of it. It was perhaps a Revival of what had been before dis-used. Nor is it likely that their Task-Masters in Egypt would

would suffer them to be Idle, and neglect their Work, one whole day in Seven.

Nor do I find any foot-steps in History that any other Nation but the Jews did (for many Ages after this time) so much as measure out their time by Weeks.

I know that many Learned and Pious men have been searching to that purpose and willing to lay hold on any thing that might seem to look that way. And I should be well enough pleased to see it made out. But I have not seen any thing convictive to give me satisfaction therein.

I have consulted Clemens Alexandrinus, and what he cites in the Fifth Book of his *Stromata*, who hath I believe made the best search of any into Heathen Writers for that purpose. His design in that Book is to shew that the Heathens had stolen or borrowed much of their *Philosophy* from what he calls *Philosophia Barbara* or *Barbarorum*, meaning thereby the Jewish Learning; (for, with the Greeks, all but themselves were Barbarians.) And amongst many other things, he takes notice of the number Seven sometimes mentioned in Heathen Writers, as with some veneration; which he thinks to be occasioned from that number oft mentioned in the Sacred Writers, and particularly from that of their Sabbath, and measuring their time by Weeks. But he doth not at all intimate as if himself did think the Heathens so to have divided their time, or to keep that Sabbath, but only that they were acquainted with the Jewish Learning, and borrowed much of theirs from thence.

That which therein seemed to me the most promising (and by others also is oft alledged) was that cited from Hesiod, *ἡ ἑβδόμη ἡμέρα* (the Seventh a Sacred day.) But when I consulted the place in Hesiod, in his *ἑρμῆς καὶ ἡμῆρας*, (in the latter part of which he treats of Days) I find nothing there of Weeks, or days of the Week, but only days of the Month. For 'tis this he there propo-  
seth to speak of, *τρεῖς δὲ μῆνες*, (the Thirty days of the Month,) on which he makes divers Remarks; as, which of them were to be accounted Good days, and which Bad days, and, for what purposes. And begins with these,

Πρῶτη, ἔτη, πρῶτε π, καὶ ἑβδόμη, ἡμέρα ἡμέρας,  
τῇ δ' Ἀπολλῶνα χρυσόεντα χίτων ἄνω.

(Begin we with the First, and the Fourth, and the Seventh, the Sacred day, Because that on this day Apollo who hath the Golden Sword

*Sword* was born of Latona.) So that (it seems) the *Seventh* day (not the *First*) was then *Sunday*. (For *Apollo* with his *Gold Sword*, is but another name for the *Sun*.) But it was the *Seventh* day of the *Month*, not the *Seventh* day of the *Week*, (for of *Weeks* he there says nothing.) And he then goes on to speak of the *Eighth* and *Ninth* days; then of the *Eleventh* and *Twelfth*, next of the *Thirteenth*, and so of other days of the *Month*; shewing which of them were accounted *Lucky* days, and which *Unlucky*, and for what *Affairs*. But nothing of *Weeks* at all.

However, *Hesiod* himself, though one of the Oldest of the *Heathen* Writers, is but young as to the times we speak of; who is reckoned to have lived about the time of King *Uzziah*, Seven Hundred years after the time we are now considering, upon the coming of *Israel* out of *Egypt*. Nor doth *Clemens Alexandrinus* think, when they name *Seven*, it was from any *Old Tradition* (from *Adam* or *Noah*) but from what acquaintance they then had with the *Jewish* Writers of later time.

Nor do I find any thing that is more to the purpose, in all there cited by *Clemens Alexandrinus* than this of *Hesiod*. But if any where he could have found, that the *Heathens* divided their Time by *Weeks*; no doubt but he would have mentioned this as borrowed from the *Jewish Learning*; (which was the thing he was there inquiring after.) And, when he saith nothing of it, we may be sure he could not find it. I find indeed that some of the *Heathens* (as *Perfius* and *Lucian*) do laugh or jeer at the *Jewish Sabbath* (*recutitae Sabbata pallent*) and therefore did know of the *Jewish Sabbath*; But not that they did observe it, or so much as divide their Time by *Weeks*.

Now if we should admit, that in some Families (where the true Worship of God was preserved) there be a strong presumption (for 'tis no more) that they did observe a *Sabbath*; that is, a *Seventh* day of *Holy Rest* after *Six* days of ordinary Labour; yet 'tis a question, whether that were just the *Seventh* day in a continual succession of *Weeks* from the Creation.

And if at any time there chance to be an intermission, and the day forgotten, it is impossible (without a Miracle or a new Revelation) that it can be restored again. And if from thenceforth they would again keep a *Sabbath* (as we find the Pass-over was revived by *Hezekiah* and *Josiah* which had been long intermitted 2 *Kings* 23. and 2 *Chr.* 25.) they must begin at adventure, and thence continue it.

Now if we consider, that the true Worship of God was oft reduced

duced to some one family, as in the time of *Noah*, and perhaps of *Abraham*; and even that Family sometimes corrupt enough, (as was that of *Nabor*, from whence *Abraham* for that reason was removed; and that of *Laban* where *Jacob* sojourned; and how oft also the like happened, we cannot tell.) It was very possible the *Sabbath* might be neglected; as himself observes p. 63, it had been before and under the Captivity for a long time; and made a *Market-day*, as well as any other day of the *Week*; like as the *Temple* was become a *Market-place*, *Mat.* 21. 12, 13. *Joh.* 2. 14. 16. As was also the Pass-over in great measure from the time of *Samuel* till that of *Josiah*, 2 *Chr.* 35. 18. And the Feast of *Tabernacles*, from the days of *Josiah* to *Nehemiah*, *Neh.* 8. 17. And *Circumcision*, for Forty years together in the Wilderness, *Josh.* 5. 5.

Now if *Circumcision* and the Pass-over and the Feast of *Tabernacles* were thus neglected when they were at Liberty; how much more the *Sabbath*, when they were *Bond-men* in *Egypt*; of which we have not the least mention from God's keeping a *Sabbath*, *Gen.* 2. 3. till after *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*, *Exod.* 16.

Nor is there the least mention (as I shew'd but now) in any History Sacred or Profane, so much as of dividing their time by *Weeks*, all that time; nor, except that of *Israel*, for many Ages after.

And though the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars* (*Gen.* 1. 14.) are said to be for Signs and for Seasons, for Days and for Years, yet not a word is there of *Weeks*. Nor could they indeed, by their Motions, distinguish *Weeks*, as they do *Months* and *Years*. And therefore though I find *Years* and *Months* to have been observed all the World over long ago; yet *Weeks* no where (that I know) of ancient times, but by the Nation of the *Jews* only, nor by them before their coming out of *Egypt*.

So that, though, I am willing to think, the *Sabbath* ought to have been observed all that while, yet there is too much reason to doubt it was not; or, if at all, not without frequent intermissions, which would, in this case, be fatal.

Now to argue as he doth, that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah*, and *Abraham*, were good men, and are (some of them) said to walk with God, and to keep his Commandments, and therefore may be presumed to have kept a *Sabbath*, is but a weak argument as to matter of Fact; and, to begg the Question. For we are not to think them so good as to be guilty of no failings or omissions.

The Law of Marriage is certainly as Old, if not Older than that of the *Sabbath*, the tenour of which was (he tells us p. 62.) that they Two should be one flesh; not, they Three, Four or Five: yet he

he tells us also, that *Poligamy*, or *having many Wives*, was frequently practised, from *Lamech* to *Malachi*, even by some eminent in the Church at that time, and by them (he supposeth) held to be lawful. And it may as well be thought, the Law for the Sabbath might sometime (within that *Two Thousand Five Hundred Years*) be neglected and forgotten; as that of *Marriage*; In a time when there was no writing (that we know of) to preserve it. And, if once forgotten, it could never (as to that *Seventh* day) be recovered.

And I would ask that Gentleman, In case the day should chance to have been sometime forgotten, (as is very possible and not unlikely,) and that after such time (upon finding the *Book of the Law*, as in *Josiah's* time *2 Kings* 22. 8. which had been lost) it did appear that a Sabbath should have been kept, but was not, (as was there the case of the *Pass-over*, *Chap.* 23. 21.) What doth this Gentleman think (in such case) should be done? Must they never Restore the Sabbath because they do not know the day? Or must they begin upon a *New Account*? I should think this latter; (and that it would be warranted by the *Fourth Commandment*;) notwithstanding his Objection, No other day (but the *Seventh* from the Creation) is Commanded; No Promise to the Observance of any other; nor Threatning for the Omission.

Indeed in our days when so great a part of the World reckon by Weeks, and we be stored with Astronomical Tables adjusted to the Motions of the Sun, Moon and Stars, and many Celestial Observations, (as for Instance, that such a Year, such a Day, of such a Month there was an Eclipse on Monday morning, or the like) 'twere more easy to rectify such an intermission. But in those days, when there was nothing of all this, nor so much as the use of Writing (that we know of) older than *Moses*; There was no way to rectify an interrupted Tradition.

All which is not said to disparage the Observation of the Sabbath day (for which I have as great Veneration as he that pleads for the *Saturday* Sabbath,) But only to shew, that we can be at no Certainty, (and scarce a Conjecture,) which is the First, Second, or Seventh day of the Week in a continued Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And consequently I cannot think that the great stress of the Fourth Commandment is to be understood of just that Seventh day in every such Week from the Creation (which I doubt cannot be known) But rather that there should be a Weekly Sabbath; that is, after Six days of Work, the Seventh should be a Holy Rest, and then, after another Six days of Work, the Seventh should be again a Holy Rest; and so continu-

tinu-

tinually; which is as truly observed in the Sunday-Sabbath, as in that of Saturday.

As when God requires the Tenth of our Increase; it is not meant of the Tenth in Order (for it should rather be the First in Order, for he requires the First-fruits) but the Tenth in Proportion; So here the Seventh.

And this Author knows very well, that it is signally noted by Expositors on the Fourth Commandment, and other Writers about the Sabbath, That this Commandment begins with Remember to keep Holy the Sabbath-day, or the day of Rest, (not the Seventh day; much less the Seventh day of the Week from the first Creation;) And what is that day of Rest, the next Words tell us, Six days shalt thou labour, but the Seventh is the Sabbath, &c. That is, after Six days of Labour, the Seventh shall be a day of Rest. And in the close of that Commandment (*Ex.* 20. 11.) our Bibles have it wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day (not as we commonly repeat it, the Seventh day) and hallowed it. The Reason given to inforce it is, For in Six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth &c. and rested the Seventh day, and accordingly should we, after Six days of Work have a Seventh day of Rest, and so onward.

If he thinks that to make a difference, that we now reckon our Weeks to begin with the day of Rest, and after that, Six Working days (which in a continued Circulation comes all to one,) I will allow that Gentleman (if that will please him better) to begin the Week on Monday, and then Sunday will be the Seventh. The Commandment says nothing of the Seventh day of the Week in a continued Succession from the Creation; but the Seventh day after Six days of Labour.

And whereas he observes (and would lay great weight upon it) that it is (as he begin) the Seventh (the article *he* answering to our *the*) not a Seventh. 'Tis very true, and very proper so to be. For the meaning is not that, after Six days of Labour, there should be a Seventh for Rest no matter when; but the Seventh day, that is, the next day after those Six.

But it is not said the Seventh in Course from the Creation. Just as when it is said, a Male-Child is to be Circumcised the Eighth day, it is not meant of an Eighth day in Course from the Creation; but, the Eighth day from the Birth. And in like manner *Ex.* 12. 16. In the Seventh day there shall be a holy Convocation; it is not meant of the Seventh day of the Week from the Creation; but on the Seventh day of the Feast of unleavened Bread, what ever

B

day

day of the Week that happen to be. And *Exod. 16. 5, 25.* The *Sixth* and *Seventh* day there mentioned, seem plainly to be, not the *Sixth* and *Seventh* in course from the *Creation* (which I doubt was not then known) but from the *first raining of Manna*, ver. 4. 5.

He'll say perhaps, the Jews observed such *Seventh* day from the *Creation*, and that was their *Sabbath*. But that is more than he or I know, or any man living. They had I grant, a Circulation of *Seven days*, but from what *Epocha* we cannot tell. And when *Moses* tells them (on the *Sixth day*) *Ex. 16. 23. To-morrow is the Rest of the Holy Sabbath.* It seems to be the fixing of a new *Epocha* (from the first raining of *Manna*) and then all his Arguments, from the continual Observation of the *Seventh* day from the *Creation* till that time, are at an end. Whether this (from the first raining of *Manna*) be the same with that from the *Creation*; no man can tell. And there is *Six to One* odds that it is not.

Now, that there is a new Course of Sabbaths (from a new beginning) whereof this *Seventh* day from the first raining of *Manna* is the *First*, and not a continuation of a former Course hitherto observed without interruption; seems farther evident from this consideration, Because, if this were but a continuation of that uninterrupted Course of Sabbaths, then the next *Seventh* day before it, would have been a *Sabbath* also, and to have been in like manner observed; that is, the next day before the first raining of *Manna*. But, on that day we find (*Exod. 16. 12, 13.*) *the Quails came up and covered the Camp*, without any Prohibition to gather them. If therefore they might not (now) gather *Manna*, because it was the *Sabbath*; but might (before) gather *Quails*; it should seem, that was not a *Sabbath*.

And if it be not allowed, upon occasion, to fix a new *Epocha*; then if the Circulation of Weeks from the beginning of the World (which was then above 2500 years old) did ever chance to have been interrupted, and the day forgotten, (as in all likelihood it might be in *Egypt*, if not long before) or if ever after it should chance so to be (as in the days of *Josiah* when the *Book of the Law* was lost, and the *Pass-over* forgotten); men must never keep a *Sabbath* thenceforth. For then all his own Arguments return upon him; No other day is Commanded ('tis Will-worship) no Promise to the Observance, no Threatning for the Neglect.

I should rather think, if that day were unknown (as I believe it is) Any day were better than None at all. For God's Commands do more respect the Substance of the Duty than the Circum-

cumstance of Time, especially if they cannot both be had.

Circumcision was to be Administred on the *Eighth* day, according to the Institution, (I do not mean the *Eighth day of the Week*, but the *Eighth day of the Childs Age*; and therefore on the same day of the Week on which the Child was Born.) But if by Accident or Default it were omitted, it might be done any day after, rather than not at all. *Abraham* we know was 99 years old, and *Ismael* 13 when they were Circumcised, (and what was the Age of other Males in *Abraham's* Family, we cannot tell;) and a Profelyte, at any Age, was to be Circumcised; (though perhaps it were not remembered on what day of the Week he was Born;) and those who were born in the Wilderness for Forty years together, were all Circumcised at once, *Josh. 5. 4, 5, 9.* (though not all born on the same day of the Week.)

The Pass-over was appointed to be eaten standing, with their Loyns girt, their Shoes on their feet, and their Staffs in their hand, as in haste to be gone *Ex. 12.* Yet our Saviour seemeth to have Eaten it Sitting, or rather Lying. And none of them were to stir out of doors till morning, *Ex. 12. 22.* Yet Christ and his Disciples went out the same night to the mount of Olives, and thence to *Gethsemane*, *Mat. 26. 30, 36.*

The Shew-bread was to be eaten by the Priests only: yet our Saviour observes that *David* did eat of it (on a special occasion) without blaming him for so doing.

The *Rechabites* are commended *Jer. 31.* for obeying the Command of *Jonathan* their Father, not to drink Wine, nor build Houses, but to dwell in Tents &c. Yet did they, upon *Nebuchadnezzar's* Invasion, quit their Tents and repair to *Jerusalem*; nor is it reputed a Disobedience.

The *Paschal Lamb* was to be killed the *Fourteenth day of the First Month at Evening*: Yet if we consider how little knowledge they had in those days, of the Sun and Moons motions, and if we consider what the Jewish Writers tell us of their very uncertain Method of judging, which was the *First Month*, and which the *Fourteenth day* of that Month, we shall find they were at great uncertainties, as to the just day; yet was not the Service thereof to be neglected, upon pretence there was danger of missing the right day.

For they had not Almanacks in those days, as we have now, to tell us before hand when will be a new Moon. But (if we may believe the Jewish Writers) their manner was, about the time when they expected a New-Moon, to send men to watch for it on

the Top of some Hill or high place; and he who could first discover a New-Moon, was to tell the Priest, and he to *blow the Trumpet* to give the People notice that there was a New-Moon, (much like our Custom at *Oxford*, at the time of the *Affizes*, to set some on *St. Maries Steeple* to watch when the Judges are coming, and then to Ring the *Great Bell* to give notice to those concerned that the Judges are at hand;) But, in case of Cloudy Weather, if in three days time from their first Expectation no man could see a New-Moon, they did then venture (but not before) to blow the Trumpet without seeing it, which must needs cause a great uncertainty; and the same Moon sooner seen at one place than at another, and the Pass-over kept accordingly. And 'tis manifest in the Story of our Saviours last Pass-over, that he kept it on one day and the Jews on another (perhaps he about a Fortnight before, might see a New-Moon, a day sooner than they did.) So great uncertainty there was at that time, as to the particular day, though the Institution was punctual for the *Fourteenth* day of the *First Month*. And the like uncertainty there was as to all their *Festivals of New-Moons*.

And even in our days, when the Motions of the Sun and Moon are much better known than at that time they were, we are far from being exact in point of time. Our Rule for *Easter* is much the same with theirs for the *Pass-over*; The Rule in general is this, *The Sunday next after the Fourteenth day of the First Month is to be Easter day*. But when we come to make particular application, we do strangely miss of our Rule. And our Paschal Tables which should direct us, do put us farther out than if we had none at all.

For (by reason that we take the length of our common year a little too long, by about Eleven minutes of an hour, and the length of our Months too long also;) since the time that those Tables were made, 'tis well known that the beginning of our Ecclesiastical First Month, is Ten or Eleven days later than that of the Heavens; and our Ecclesiastical New-Moons and Full-Moons, is later by Four or Five days than those of the Heavens. Whereby we do very often mistake the *Month*, and yet ofner the true *Week*, for keeping of *Easter*. And though Pope Gregory the Eighth, did (somewhat more than an Hundred years ago) somewhat rectify the Calendar, yet both Papists and Protestants do observe, some the Newer *Gregorian*, and some the Older *Julian* account, and (in the United Provinces of the *Netherlands*) one Town observes one account, and the next the other account

and

and accordingly keep their *Easters* (if at all) at Three, Four or Five Weeks distance.

And so for Christmas-day. 'Tis not agreed amongst Chronologers either what Year, or what Month, much less what day of that Month, our Saviour was born, yet we keep *December 25th* in memory of his Birth, as supposing him to have been then born. Yet we are at so great uncertainty, that we reckon the year 1692 from his *Circumcision*, to begin the First of *January*; but the same year as from his *Conception*, not till the 25th of *March* next following; as if his Birth and Circumcision had been a quarter of a year before his Conception.

And if we be now at so great an uncertainty, in so short a Period as from the Birth of Christ, I do not think the Jews could be punctual, as to a day, in observing their Pass-over; and much less, as to a day from the Creation of the World.

He'll say perhaps, that *Easter* and *Christmas* being of humane Institution, it is not much matter though we miss the day, nor much matter perhaps whether it be kept or no. Be it so; But the Pass-over was of Divine Institution; yet were they at a great uncertainty, and might chance to miss more than a day or two; yet was not the Duty to be therefore neglected. The mistake of a Day was of much less concernment than the neglect of the Duty; As was the *Tithing of Mint and Annise*, than the *weightier things of the Law*. These little Circumstances are but *Shadows*, in comparison of the *Substance*, as the Comparison is *Col. 2. 17*.

Which is not said to encourage any one to violate the Laws of God, even in little things, (for we find God sometimes very severe even in such; as in the Case of *Uzzah's touching the Ark*, and *Nadab and Abihu's offering strange Fire*; for Reasons best known to himself, of which we are not aware.) But onely to shew that the Substantials of a Duty are to be regarded more than Circumstantials; and these upon occasion to give way to those. And in such Cases (if it were a fault) the Prayer of *Hezekiah* (*2 Chr. 30. 18.*) is to take place, *The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, though he be not cleansed according to the Purification of the Sanctuary*. And his Service was accepted, though (as it is expressly noted) *they did eat the Pass-over otherwise than as it was written*. And, in the *Second Month*, in stead of the *First*.

And doubtless in the present case, If we do not know (as certainly we do not) which is the *First* or *Seventh* day in a continual

Circu-

Circulation from the Creation, it is much better to keep a Weekly Sabbath on any day of the Week whatever, than to keep none at all, and much more agreeable to the true meaning of the Fourth Commandment.

All which is said, partly by way of Caution, not to be forward, upon slight grounds, to disturb the Peace and settled practise of the whole Christian Church at this day.

Partly to take off what he would have to be admitted but cannot be proved, that the Seventh day in a continued Circulation of Weeks from the first Creation, was observed as the Weekly Sabbath, from the Creation to the Flood; from thence to *Abraham*; from thence to *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*; and from thence till after the Resurrection of Christ. Which I think is impossible for any man to know.

And partly to satisfy what he objects from the Fourth Commandment. Which saith indeed that there is to be a *Rest* on the *Seventh day after Six days of Labour*; but not a word of its being such Seventh day in a continual Circulation of Weeks from the Creation. And therefore we are safe hitherto, for ought I see.

But I'll come up a little nearer to him. He may perhaps tell us, (though I do not find he doth) that the Jews did certainly keep their Weekly Sabbath (at the time of our Saviours death) on what they called the *Seventh day*. If not on the Seventh day of the Week from the Creation (of which we can have no certainty) at least on the Seventh day of the Week, as the Weeks were then reckoned; (which I readily grant him;) and that they had so done for a long time before, and perhaps from the time of giving the Law on Mount *Sinai*. (And it may be so, for ought I know, but we cannot be certain.) And what was then called the *First day of the Week*, was another day from what they called the *Seventh* (which I admit also.) And that, what they called the *Seventh day*, is now what we call *Saturday*; and what they called the *First day* is what we now call *Sunday*. But this, I say, is more than he or I know. He may think so; and so do I; but I am not sure of it.

The reason why I think so, is, because I think that Christ or his Apostles (according to Christs direction) did remove the observation of the Sabbath, from the Seventh to the First day of the Week, and that we have ever since kept the Sabbath as they did, (for I do not know that it hath been since altered,) and as we now keep it on Sunday, so I believe they did; and therefore think that our Sunday is what they called the First day.

And

And if the Apostles did then remove it from their Seventh day to their First day, I presume they had direction from Christ so to do, who after his Resurrection, *shewed himself to them for Forty days, giving Commandments to his Apostles, speaking to them of things pertaining to the Kingdom of God*, Acts i. 2, 3. And therefore, what they did afterwards in settling the Christian Church, they did (we are to presume) according to such Directions and Commandments of Christ, and this in particular of so removing the Observation of the Sabbath day, if they did remove it, (as I think was done) by his Authority who was *Lord of the Sabbath day*. *Matthew 23:8. Luke 6:5.*

But if they did not so remove it; I do not know that it hath since been changed. For I think we keep the same Sabbath which they did; and that the Christian Church hath ever since so done; and doth pretend so to have done, by a constant Tradition ever since. And we therefore think our Sunday to be their First day of the Week, because we think their Sabbath so to have been. But if we mistake in that Tradition, we are (for ought I know) accordingly mistaken in thinking Sunday to be their First day; (For we have nothing but Tradition for either.) And then for ought he can shew (by better than Tradition) to the contrary, our Sunday may be their Seventh day. And then he hath no pretense to quarrel with it.

If he say the Jews do at this day keep Saturday as their Seventh day, I confess they do. But they do no more know which is the Seventh day; than we, which is the First day. And because they find that Christians generally take Sunday to be what was before called the First day, they do accordingly take Saturday to be their Seventh day. But their Tradition is of no greater Authority than ours. All depending upon this, that our Sunday being that Sabbath which we think Christ or his Apostles did appoint, we take it to be the First day, because Christ or his Apostles (by Christs directions) did remove the observation of the Sabbath to that day.

He'll say perhaps, I do not my self think our Sunday to be their Seventh day. And then, why should not our Sabbath be on Saturday as theirs was?

'Tis true, I do not think our Sunday to be their Seventh day. And I have told you the reason why I do not think it; Because I think Christ or his Apostles did change the day, and for that reason only. And for the same reason I think our Sabbath should be as now it is, and as I think it hath been ever since. But if I be mistaken

mistaken in it, I may be mistaken in the other also: But, either way, Sunday is yet to be our Sabbath.

He says, It is no where *expressly said in Scripture*, that the Apostles did thus change it. True, and 'tis no where said in Scripture that our Sunday is not their Seventh day. It may be the same for ought I know, (and for ought he knows) if it were not then changed. Though, because I think the day was then changed, I do therefore think it is not the same. And if it were not changed, then all the difference is, that what they called the Seventh day of their Week, we call the First day of our Week. Which, if the Author do not like, he may call Monday the First day, and then Sunday will be the Seventh, as it was before.

But I say further; There be many things, even as to the Worship of God, which we may reasonably think to have been done, though it be not *expressly said so*; but only to be collected by consequence from what is said.

'Tis no where said expressly, that, after the First Sabbath of God himself, (*Gen. 2. 2.*) any other Sabbath was ever kept before that in *Exod. 16.* which was above Two Thousand and Five Hundred Years after. Yet this Author would have us think it was *observed* all that while; and that it was *commanded* so to be, which yet is no where said expressly. But a slight presumption, it seems, may serve his turn, but not ours.

'Tis known that God was Worshipped by *Sacrifices* very early; at least as early, as that of *Cain* and *Abel*; and that this Worship was accepted of God, at least that of *Abel*; And therefore I suppose this Author would have us think it was *Commanded*. (not a meer *Will-worship*, without any Direction or Institution from God.) Yet we are no where told, of any such Command or Institution.

We may say the like of *Jacob's* consecrating a *Pillar*, by *pouring Oil* upon it; (*Gen. 28. 18.* though we do not find mention, before that time, of any direction for any such *Consecration* (of things or persons) by *Anointing*, or *Pouring on of Oil*.)

We have also reason to think there was some Command from God, that the Fire for *Incense* should be taken from the *Altar*, (or somewhat of like nature;) else *Nadab* and *Abihu* would not have been destroyed for *Offering strange Fire*. Yet we are no where *told expressly* of any such Command.

We have no particular Command (that I know of) for Baptizing of Infants, nor any particular mention in Scripture of any such Baptized. Yet I do not know that this Author would have

have us thence infer, that none such were baptized, or that they ought not so to be.

Nor have we any express mention of *Womens* receiving the other Sacrament; nor any express Command for their so doing (any more than for Females being Circumcised) yet I know not any who doth therefore think they ought not.

We know that Children were reputed Members of the Church of God before Christ's coming; and we have no reason to think that Christ did put them out (and make them in a worse condition than they were before) but rather would have them continue so to be; and seems to favour it, by that of *suffer little Children to come to me, and forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven* *Mar. 10. 14.* and did accordingly embrace them as such. And therefore, as (*before*) they were *Circumcised*, (which was then the Sacrament of Admision;) So they should (*now*) be *Baptized* (which is our Sacrament of Admision.) And when we find whole Families to be Baptized, we cannot think but that there might be little Children in some of them; (and more likely so than otherwise.) And we are, in such cases, to practise according to what we may judge by what we find. We find also that *Women* were *Baptized* (though not *Circumcised* in the Jewish Church,) yet we have no Command for so doing. And because there seems to be the same reason for *Womens* receiving the other Sacrament as for *Men*, (and we find nothing to the contrary,) therefore we do now practise it (as the most likely to be God's Will, according to the Light we now have) though we find in Scripture neither express Precept nor Example for it.

In like manner it is no Argument that Christ or his Apostles did not make such a change, because in Scripture it is not expressly said so. 'Tis enough if we there find so much as that we may thence reasonably Judge they did so; and more likely so than not.

Now I meet with so much there to that purpose, as makes me judge they did. And so much as (I believe) would make this Gentleman so to think, if he were not otherwise prepossessed with prejudice; and with a great fondness to find out somewhat where-with to find fault.

I find that Christ, on the very day of his Resurrection (which was the *First day of their Week*) did not only appear to the good *Women* at the Sepulchre (who sought him there) and declare to them the *Resurrection* (which was then to *Preach* a new Doctrine, of which they were not before aware) and *bid them* tell it to his Disciples: But did also the same day himself declare it to

Two of them going to *Emmaus* (*Luk. 24.*) *Preaching* to them, from *Moses and the Prophets* ver. 25, 26, 27. The Doctrine of his *Death and Resurrection* (which was to them a new Doctrine, which till then they did not understand,) for (as the Phrase there is) did *Expound to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself* ver. 27. which I think, was *Preaching*; and did open to them the Scriptures (*ver. 31.*) concerning those points; (which was a Sabbath-days exercise, though perhaps they did not at first so apprehend it) and did, I take it, celebrate with them the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper* (and perhaps the first time after the first Institution) for so much seems to be implied in those words (*ver. 30.*) *he took bread and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them;* and (*ver. 35.*) *he was known to them by breaking of Bread.* (for that Sacrament used to be designed by *breaking of Bread.*) And if our Author could but shew so much as this, once done, in the first 2500 years from the Creation, on the Seventh day, it would be a better proof for the Celebration of the *Seventh-day Sabbath* in that time, than all that he offers as to that purpose. And the Effect of his *Preaching* was on them so much that *their eyes were opened, and their heart did burn within them, while he talked with them by the way, and opened to them the Scriptures,* ver. 31, 32. and they returned presently (the same hour) to *Jerusalem*, to acquaint the Disciples (who were there assembled) with this good news.

If he tell us that this Journey from *Jerusalem* to *Emmaus* (being about *Threescore Furlongs*, near Eight of our Miles) and back again, was more than a Sabbath-days Journey; I confess it was (unless upon an urgent occasion) if they had known it to be a Sabbath-day, when they undertook the Journey; but this then they knew not; nor was it therefore, on this occasion, a breach of the Sabbath so to do.

If he say, *Christ* knew it (though they did not) if it were now a Sabbath. 'Tis true; he did so. But *Christ*, I presume, in that estate (after his Resurrection) could Travel without Pain, and therefore without breaking the Sabbath. Or if it were painful; he tells us *Mat. 12. 5.* that the *Priests in the Temple* profane the Sabbath and are blameless; that is, they take as much pains of labour in killing, dressing, and offering the Sacrifices, as a Butcher would do in killing and dressing his meat; which would in the Butcher be a culpable profanation of the Sabbath; but is not so in the Priests, because theirs is *Religious Service*. Nor doth this Author think that in *Preaching*, though it be a Labour, the Minister doth thereby break the Sabbath. And such was *Christ's* im-

employment here. And, then, whether he Preach Standing, or Preach Walking, 'tis all one.

And if he say farther, that the Disciples at *Jerusalem* (not then knowing this) could not be thought then to have met upon a Sabbath-day account: I grant this also, that their then meeting was Providential (as was that of the Two other meeting *Christ* in their Journey,) yet they might before they parted (as did those others) know more of it than at their first coming together. And *Christ* knew before what he meant to do, though they did not, and did accordingly so order it by his Providence. And though they did not know that it was thenceforth to be kept as a Sabbath, yet may they well be supposed to be employed on Religious Work, upon what Tidings the Women had before brought them (of *Christ's* being Risen) waiting for what directions they should farther receive from *Christ*.

To this purpose let us consider what was further done at this meeting. While these Two were telling the rest what had happened to them; *As they thus spake* (*ver. 36.*) *Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and said Peace be unto you:* And did (by shewing them his hands, and feet, and their handling of him, and seeing him eat before them) convince them that he was indeed Risen from the Dead, and that it was not only a Spirit that appeared to them (*ver. 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42.*) And did again, to them, Preach the same Doctrine which he had before preached to the Two; That it was what he had told them while he was yet with them. (though they did not understand it,) That this was but what was written in the Law of *Moses*, and the Prophets, and the Psalms concerning him; and opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures; That it was thus written, that it behoved *Christ* to suffer and to rise from the Dead the Third day; and that Repentance and Remission of Sins was to be Preached in his Name amongst all Nations; whereof they were to be his Witnesses, and Apostles (*ver. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48.*) And did renew his Promise of sending the Holy Ghost, and Power from on high (*ver. 49.*) He did moreover at the same meeting, not only upbraid them for their unbelief, (*Mark 16. 14.*) but did Authorize them with a solemn Commission for the Work they were to be sent about; to Go into all the World, and Preach the Gospel to every Creature; that he who believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he who believeth not shall be damned; (*ver. 15, 16.*) and a Power to work Miracles (*ver. 17, 18.*) in confirmation of that Doctrine.

And to the same purpose, *John 20. 19.* The same day at Evening

(in which he before appeared to *Mary Magdalen* and the rest) being the *First day of the Week* (the very day of his Resurrection) where the Disciples were assembled (at a private meeting) for fear of the Jews (the door being shut) Jesus came, and stood in the midst of them, and gave them his Solemn Benediction, saying unto them, *Peace be unto you*; And in Confirmation of his Resurrection, shewed them his hands and his side; (ver. 20.) And then a *Second* time gives them his Solemn Blessing together with his Ordination or Commission for Preaching the Gospel, and Planting the Christian Church, Jesus saith to them, *Again, Peace be unto you*; As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed upon them and said unto them, *Receive the Holy Ghost: Who's soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted to them, and who's soever Sins ye retain, they are retained*, ver. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

All which being put together, seems to me very like the Celebration (if not the Consecration) of a Christian Sabbath, or day of Holy Rest and Religious Service. 'Tis all of it *Sabbatical Work*, and there is a great deal of it.

'Tis not indeed expressly said, That he did bid them thus to meet on such other *First day* of the Week, (as neither is expressly said, Gen. 2. 3. that God did then bid Adam and Eve to keep a Weekly Sabbath, or that he did bid them to offer Sacrifice;) but it is very likely Christ might so order it (and more likely than that he did not.) For, that they did so meet we are sure; and therefore 'tis very likely (if not a strong presumption) that they were bid so to do. For so we find it Job. 20. 26. *After Eight days* (that is, as we commonly speak in English, *on that day Sennight*) his Disciples were again within, and Thomas with them (who before was absent) the door being shut; then Jesus came and stood in the midst and said *Peace be unto you*, (as he had done the Week before,) and satisfied Thomas, who before doubted.

So that we have here Two Solemn meetings of the Disciples, Two Weeks together, (the Two first after his Resurrection) on the *First day of the Week*; and Christ with them on both. (And I am sure we have not more for the First Sabbath, Gen. 2. 3.) On how many more such Sabbaths he so met with them, I cannot tell. That he oft appeared to them (during the Forty days of his abode on Earth after his Resurrection) we cannot doubt, and its like it might be on these days.

The Cavil which here he makes to this place, is so weak, that I am sorry to see it from one who would seem to be serious. As if *Eight days after*, or *after Eight days*, were not the same as what

we

we would say a *Week after* or that day *Sennight after*; For he must needs know, that 'tis not only the Common Scripture Language, but the general Language of Latine and Greek Writers, to reckon *Inclusively*; that is, to take in both the extremes; and so it is even at this day (I think) in most Languages except English. What we call a *Sennight*, the French call *huit jours* (Eight days) and what we say a *Fortnight*, is with them *Quinze jours* (Fifteen days;) and so in all manner of reckoning. A *Fourth*, a *Fifth*, an *Eighth*, a *Fifteenth*, and other *Intervals* in *Musick* are always so reckoned. What we call a *Third-day-Agave*, the Latins call a *Quartan*; and what we call every other day, they call a *Tertian*. So they call *Secundo Calendas* (i. e. *Secundo die ante Calendas*) what we would say *one day* (not *two days*) before the *Calends*; and they call *tertio Calendas*, what is with us *two days* (not *three days*) before the *Calends*. So *nudius tertius* is what we would say *two days ago*; and *nudius quartus* is in our Language *Three days ago* (not *Four*.) So Mark 8. 31, where Christ speaks of himself, that the Son of Man should be killed and after *three days rise again*, that is, *on the Third day after* (inclusively taken) or *after the Third day is come*; whereas, according to the sense this Author would put upon the words, it should rather have been said *after one day* (for there was but *one day* between his Death and Resurrection;) And it is the same in sense, with what he says Job. 2. 19. *Destroy this Temple*, (speaking of his Body) *And in Three days I will raise it up*, *it resurget*, or as Mat. 26. 61. *Et resurget*, that is, *the Third after* (inclusively.) And Mat. 27. 63. they tell Pilate, *This Deceiver said, After Three days will I rise again*, *et resurget* (meaning thereby *the Third day after, inclusively*;) and therefore they pray, that the Sepulchre may be made sure till the *third Day*. Whereas, if (as our Author would reckon upon his fingers) by *after Three days*; were to be understood, when *Three whole days* after that should be past, they need not set their Watch before the *Fourth* or *Fifth* day. Thus Christ's *Ascension* is said to be *Forty days after* his *Resurrection*, (speaking of a Scripture Computation, in Scripture Language,) which in our ordinary manner of Speech is but *Nine and Thirty*. For *Ascension-Thurs'day* (if *Easter-day* be not reckoned for one) is but 39 days after Easter. Upon a like Account that Christ tells us Mat. 12. 40. that as Jonas was *three days and three nights in the Whales Belly*, so shall the Son of Man be *three days and three nights in the heart of the Earth*. Not *Three whole days*, and *Three whole nights*; but, till the *Third* was begun. For by day

day and night is here understood the *24 hours*, or what we now call the *Artificial day*, consisting of 24 hours; day and night; and till such Third day (or *24 hours*) was begun, Christ rested in the Grave; otherwise, though he were in the Grave (part of) Three days, yet but Two nights.

So Luke 2. 21. When Eight days were accomplished (for the Circumcision of the Child) they called his name Jesus; that is, upon the Eighth day, inclusively; reckoning the day of Birth for the first, and the day of Circumcision for the last (of the Eight days) which with Six whole days between make Eight. Whereas, if Eight whole days had been fully past; Christ had been Circumcised the Tenth day. The sense being the same with that concerning John the Baptist, Luke 1. 19. On the Eighth day they came to Circumcise the Child. So here, After Eight days, that is on the Eighth day, or after the Eighth day was come. And this, I think, is the constant Language of Scripture every where. And his Objection needs no other Answer, but, that St. John did not speak English.

And I cannot but think (however he please thus to Object) that himself doth believe this; after Eight days, to be here meant of the First day of the next Week, (and he should have been so candid as to own it.) And that *post Octo dies* is the same in sense with *Octo post diebus*, that is, the Eighth day after, (reckoning the present day for one,) and that it is so to be understood in this place. We should not, in a serious Enquiry, press what possibly might be, but what we truly think is the meaning. A Lawyer at the Bar may fairly propose For his Client, what possibly may be the sense of such or such a Clause. But a Judge on the Bench (and a Counsellor, To his Client,) is to consider what really is the sense of Words in question. I dare appeal to himself, whether (in his own thoughts) he do not think after Eight days, here to signify the same, as after Eight days were accomplished, Luk. 2. 21. And, if so, then this is rather to Wrangle, than to Dispute fairly.

Before I dismiss this place, it is not amiss to take more particular notice about what time it was that Mary Magdalen and the other Women came to the Sepulchre on the day of Christ's Resurrection. 'Tis said Luke 23. 55. When they beheld the Sepulchre and how the body was laid, (on the sixth day at night whereon he was Crucified) they returned and prepared Spices and Ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment. And in the next words Luk. 24. 1. Now upon the First day of the Week, very early in the morning, they came to the Sepulchre

bringing the Spices which they had prepared. In Mat. 28. 1. In the end of the Sabbath when it began to dawn toward the First day of the Week. In Mark 16. 1. When the Sabbath was past, very early in the morning the First day of the Week, they came to the Sepulchre at the rising of the Sun, or by Sun-rising. And Joh. 20. 1. The First day of the Week, early, when it was yet dark, they came to the Sepulchre. (Perhaps all the Women did not come just at the same time; but were all there by Sun-rising.) But the Body was raised before they came, as is agreed by all the Evangelists.

Where I observe First that the Sabbath, according to their Account, did not end till toward the morning of the next day. The end of the Sabbath, or when the Sabbath was past, was early in the morning, before the Sun-rising, while the day did begin to dawn, and while it was yet dark. Very early indeed in the morning, but yet not till morning, (not in the Evening over night.) And therefore (without disputing how the day was reputed to begin in the time of Moses) 'tis manifest that, at this time, as well the Sabbath as other days was by them reckoned not from (the beginning of) the Evening to (the beginning of) the Evening, but rather (according to the Rom. account) from Midnight to Midnight.

For 'tis manifest that it was toward Evening of the Sixth day before the Crucifixion was over; For it was some while after the Ninth hour (that is, after our Three a Clock) that he cried with a loud voice and gave up the Ghost, Mark 15. 34, 37. And it was yet later, when they brake the Legs of the two Thieves, (that they might not remain on the Cross upon the Sabbath) but only pierced his side, because he was already dead, Joh. 19. 31, 32, 33, 34. And later yet when Joseph of Arimathea begged his Body and buried it. For 'tis expressly said, When Even was come there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, and begged the body of Jesus, and when he had taken the Body, he wrapped it in a clean linnen Cloth and buried it in his own new Tomb, Mat. 27. 57, 58, 59, 60. Mark 15. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46. Luk. 23. 51, 52, 53.

But, though Even were come before this time, yet the Sabbath was not begun, for so it followeth, Luk. 23. 54. that day was the Preparation and the Sabbath drew on.

And after this, ver. 55, 56. the Women who beheld the Sepulchre, and how the Body was laid, returned and prepared Spices and Ointments (the same night) but rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment; And by this time it must needs be pretty late at night, while yet the Sabbath was not begun. That is, I suppose not till Midnight of the Sixth day.

Ner

Nor was the Sabbath ended when Evening began on the Seventh day. For if so, the Women might that night have brought and applyed their *Spices and Ointments* which they had prepared the night before. For they had as much time so to do, after the Evening was begun that night (if the Sabbath were now ended) as they had, to do what was done the night before; after that Evening was then begun. Nothing hindered them but because the Sabbath was not yet done, and they were to *rest the Sabbath day according to the Commandment*. But, so soon as well they could, *when the Sabbath was ended*, they came *early*, the next morning, while it was yet dark. And might as well have come the night before, if the Sabbath had ended when the evening began.

I add farther, If the Sabbath had ended at the evening of the Seventh day, and the First day of the Week had then begun (as this author would have it,) Christ might have risen that night (for it would then have been the *Third day*;) and not have stay'd in the grave (for the third day) till the next morning, which yet we know he did.

'Tis manifest therefore that the First day of the Week did begin from the middle of the night, not from the First Evening of the Seventh day. And that Christ was risen *very early in the morning* of that *First day* while it was yet dark.

We are next to Consider how long that First day lasted. After Christ was risen *early* in the morning while it was yet dark, (how early that was, we cannot tell, but it was in the Morning, not over night;) he appeared first to *Mary Magdalen*, and the Women who went to the Sepulchre; they, as they were directed carried news of it to the Disciples; and *when they were going*, (Mat. 28. 11.) *the Watch came into the City and shewed to the High Priests the things which were done; who calling a Council, gave the Souldiers Money to say, His Disciples came and stole him away while they were asleep; undertaking to secure them in case the Governour should come to hear it.*

Upon this news being brought by the Women to the Disciples, Two of them, from the rest, went to the Sepulchre to enquire into the business; and brought an account of it to the rest, who were Astonished at it.

And all this happened before the Two Disciples began their Journey to *Emmaus*; for they discoursed of it by the way, and told it to *Jesus* who fell into their Company, Luk. 24. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. Now their Journey from *Jerusalem* to *Emmaus*, was about *Threescore Furlongs*, ver. 13. which our Author rightly computes

putes to be about *Seven miles and an half*, of our miles; which they *Travelled on foot*, for 'tis said *they walked*, (Mark 16. 12.) and *Jesus* in their company, Preaching to them (out of *Moses and the Prophets*) the Doctrine of Christ's Death and Resurrection.

When they came near to *Emmaus* it was towards Evening, and *the day far spent*, (Luk. 24. 29.) they did there abide for some time, and *Jesus* with them, continuing to Preach on the same Subject, and was at length known to them by *breaking of Bread*, ver. 30, 35. After which they returned to *Jerusalem* and told these things to the *Disciples then gathered together*, ver. 33. By which time (having now walked another *Seven miles and an half*) we may reasonably suppose it to be pretty late at night; For, when they first approached to *Emmaus* it was then so late, as that it was not thought convenient (unless upon some such great occasion) to Travel further, ver. 28.

Yet, after they were come back to *Jerusalem*, Christ then appeared himself to the Disciples,  *blessing them, reproaching their unbelief, confirming their Faith*, giving them *Instructions*, and *Commission for Preaching the Gospel, and Planting the Christian Church*. And it was yet but *the same day at Evening, being the First day of the Week*, (Joh. 20. 19.) on which he rose: but, now late at night, *when the doors were shut*; that is, (if I mistake not) so late as that it was time to shut up doors as men use to do towards bed-time. Not as if Christ came in through the Key-hole (any more than did the Two Disciples that came from *Emmaus*) or did Penetrate the doors, (as the Papiists would have us think in favour of their *Transubstantiation*;) For they were not so shut but that they could be opened again (upon occasion) to let him in (as they had been to let in those Two that came from *Emmaus*) as well as to let in *Peter* (late at night) Act. 12. 16.

So that from *very early* in the Morning while it was dark, till *very late night* and about *Mid-night*, was the same day, the *first day of the Week*. 'Tis manifest therefore that about our Saviours time, according to the Computation of the New-Testament, both the Jews and the Four Evangelists did reckon their days, from mid-night to mid-night. And if they did not so reckon, Christ could not be said (Mat. 12. 40.) to be *three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*. For it was Evening, when *Joseph* begged the Body of *Jesus*, and later yet before he had buried it, and yet this must be reckoned *part of the Sixth day*, else he had not been *three days* in the Grave, or *heart of the earth*.

And I think they were so reckoned in the times of the Old Te-

flament also. Which though it be not so much to the present purpose, yet (if you will pardon this digression) I will tell you why I think so. It is I know an Opinion taken up by some (and I find it is grown pretty current even amongst Learned men) that the Jews in the time of the Old Testament did reckon their days from Evening to Evening (whether they mean from Sun-set to Sun-set, or from Six a Clock to Six a Clock, I cannot tell, nor perhaps are they all agreed as to that point.) But I take it to be a mistake; which being at first taken up without sufficient ground, hath since passed (without further examination) from hand to hand.

We find *Exod. 12. 6.* the Pass-over was to be killed in the First month, on the *Fourteenth day in the Evening*; which I think is agreed by all to be the Evening at the end of the Fourteenth day, (not that at the end of the Thirteenth,) for the next morning was the Fifteenth day; which Evening therefore belonged to the Fourteenth day.

But it is noted in the Margin of our Bibles, that it is, in the Hebrew, *between the two Evenings*. You'll ask perhaps, what are those *two Evenings*: I'll tell you what I think they are.

The word *Day*, you know, is taken in a double sense. Sometimes for (what we call) the *Natural* day (as it is contradistinguished to night) from Sun-rising to Sun-setting: sometimes for (what we call) the *Artificial* day (or *יוֹם מְשֻׁבָּר*) so as to take in both day and night. Our Saviour tells us *there are Twelve hours in the day*; meaning the *Natural* day. But in the *Artificial* day (of which we are now speaking) there be *Four and Twenty* hours. Some please to call that the *Natural* day, which I call the *Artificial* (for all do not use the words in the same sense) But that matters not, so long as we understand one another.

Now by the word *Evening* is understood *the end of the day*. Which, as to the *Natural* day, is at *Sun-set*; but as to the *Artificial* day, it is (I think) at *Mid-night*. And consequently, *between the two Evenings*, is as much as to say, *after Sun-set, and before Mid-night*. And this is what, in our Language, we commonly call the *Evening*, which is in the Hebrew *between the two Evenings*, (that is, between the end of the *Natural* day, and the end of the *Artificial* day:) and within this time was the Pass-over to be *Killed, Roasted and Eaten*; *Nothing of it was to remain till the Morning*; that is, not after *Mid-night*; for as soon as *Mid-night* is past *Morning* begins. And within this time all *Leaven* was to be put away; that is, before the *Mid-night* of the Fourteenth day. Which is so fair an account of it, as that we

need

need not scruple to embrace it. And it was the *Fifteenth* day, that was the *first day* of the *Feast of Unleavened bread*; (all *Leaven* being put away before *Mid-night*;) and this *Fifteenth* day was to be kept as a *Sabbath*, and a *Holy Feast to the Lord*, ver. 14. (on what ever day of the Week it chanced to fall.) And so was the *One and Twentieth* day, which was the last of those *Seven* days: *Seven days shall ye eat Unleavened-bread; even the first day ye shall put away (or shall have put away) leaven out of your house. And in the First day there shall be an Holy Convocation, and in the Seventh day there shall be an Holy Convocation; no manner of Work shall be done in them, save that which every man shall eat; (that is they are to be kept as a Sabbath or day of Holy rest;)* ver. 15, 16. From the *Fourteenth day at Evening* till the *One and Twentieth day at Evening*, ver. 18. that is, from the Fourteenth day at *Mid-night*, till the *One and Twentieth* at *Mid-night*. And in like manner, *Lev. 23. 32. from Even to Even, or Night to Night*, that is, from *Mid-night* to *Mid-night*; or from the end of one *Evening* to the end of the next *Evening*. So in *Levit. 23. 5.* and *Numb. 28. 16, 17. In the Fourteenth day of the First month is the Pass-over of the Lord; and in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast; Seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten, &c.* Where it is manifest that the *fourteenth* day which is the *Lords Pass-over* is another day from the *fifteenth* which is the *first day of the Feast*. For I will pass through the land of Egypt (saith God) *this night*, (that is the night of the Fourteenth day) and will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, *Ex. 12. 12.* And what time of the night it was, we are told ver. 28. *And it came to pass at Mid-night the Lord smote all the first-born of the land of Egypt.* And to the same purpose *Moses* tells *Pharaoh*, chap. 11. 4, 5, 6, 7, *Thus saith the Lord. About Mid-night will I go out into the midst of Egypt, And the first-born of the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh, &c. that ye may know that the Lord hath put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel.* So that the *fourteenth* day, which was the *Lords Pass-over* continued till the *Mid-night* of that day; and then began the *fifteenth* day which was the *first day of the Feast*. Than which I think nothing can be more clear. And *Num. 33. 3. The fifteenth day of the first month is the morrow after the Pass-over.* In like manner, *Deut. 16. 6. Thou shalt Sacrifice the Pass-over at even, at the going down of the Sun*, (that is, after the going down of the Sun, or when the Sun is gone down) *at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt*, which was about *Mid-night*, *Ex. 12. 21. Ex. 11. 4.*

D 2

What

What he offers from *Gen. 1. 5.* is easily answered. *The evening and the morning were the first day,* (and so of the other days;) Whence he would have it thought, that the day is to begin at the beginning of the Evening. Or (as the Margin tells us it is in the Hebrew) *the evening was, and the morning was, the first day.* Or, *there was evening, and there was morning, day one,* (for in such order the words stand in the Hebrew.) Or, *and was evening; and was morning, day one.* That is, there was in the first day, (and so in the rest) *evening and morning;* or darkness and light; And the Dark is put first, because (beginning the day from Mid-night) the dark is before the Light. And by *day one,* is meant *the first day.*

And it was moreover very agreeable so to reckon. For, supposing Paradise the principal seat of Action; the Sun may reasonably be supposed to be Created (in the middle of the Fourth day, *Gen. 1. 16.*) in the Meridian of that place, (as in its greatest Splendor) or, if not in the Meridian of that place, it must needs be in the Meridian of some place: and wherever that be, the day (of 24 hours) being there half past, it must have begun at Mid-night foregoing. And I doubt not but a Child born on *Saturday night at Ten a Clock,* was to be Circumcised the *next Saturday* (as being the *Eighth day,*) not on the *Sunday after.*

I have insisted the longer on this, because I find him afterward moving another question about what time the Sabbath is to *begin and end,* and lays great stress upon it, as we shall see anon.

Of which I think we need not be further solicitous than to begin and end this day, according as other days are accounted to begin and end in the places where we live. I do not think the *Fourth Commandment* to descend to these *Punctilio's.*

But, if he think it necessary to be more curious in it; I take it to be very plain from what I have said, that at the time of Christs Death and Resurrection, it was accounted to begin *very early in the morning,* while it was dark, and continue till *very late at night,* according as we now account our days, from Mid-night to Mid-night. But I go on.

We have now found our Saviours *Example,* as to the two First Sundays from his Resurrection (if at least their *first day of the Week* be our *Sunday*) imploying the day in Religious Exercises and Sabbatical Affairs with his Disciples. How many more Sundays he so spent with them we cannot tell. Which Examples of his Two first, with their Imitation of him in others after, (of which we are to speak by and by,) and the Churches practise ever

since

since, looks so like the *Celebration* and *Institution* of a Christian Sabbath, or *day of Holy Rest and Religious Exercise,* as that we may warrantably do the like. I am sure it is more than he can shew for the *Saturday Sabbath* in *Gen. 2. 3.* Save that men are apt to think a small thing an *Institution* and *Jus Divinum* for what they fancy; but, as to what they do not, nothing will serve but Full Express Words.

We have next clear Evidence, of a like *Practise* (consonant to this *Example*) in *Act. 20. 7.* *On the first day of the Week when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul Preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his Speech until Mid-night.* Which is so plain that he is much put to his shifts to avoid it. That there is a *Religious Assembly* of the Disciples, he doth not deny; *Paul was Preaching* very late, even till Mid-night, and they met to *break bread,* which I think is generally agreed by Interpreters, to signify the *Celebration* of the *Lords Supper;* and I know not well what clearer Character we need demand of a *Religious meeting for Worship,* suitable to the Work of a Sabbath or *Holy Rest.* And it was *ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ὁμέρᾳ,* which I think he will not deny, (though he seem to cavil at it) to signify, *on the first day of the Week.* But he excepts, that the word *ᾠκίζων* here translated *Preached,* is elsewhere render'd *Reasoned* or *Discoursed.* Be it so, and if that word will please him better, let it be so here; he *reasoned, discoursed, treated, or did hold forth;* that I think will not alter the case; and he continued, or held on (*ᾠκίζων*) this *Discourse, this Speech, this Sermon,* (*ἡ λόγον Sermonem*) till Mid-night; (he held on this holding forth till Mid-night) which I take to be the same with what we now call *Preaching,* (or very like it;) 'twas a long continued discourse to a Congregation met together on a Religious account for the Service of God. But let it be called (if he please) a *Religious Discourse* of the Holy Apostle to a Congregation of Christians met together for such a purpose.

He would then have it thought a favour or condescension to admit this *breaking of bread,* to be meant of the *Lords Supper;* and not barely a *Common eating.* But since he doth not deny it, we will accept the favour and take it so to be; *συνεστῆσαν ἅμυντες ἵνα φάγονται ἅγαν, The Disciples being congregated or assembled to break Bread.* 'Tis *ἅμυντες*, *The Disciples;* (not *ἑκάστη* some of them;) and they were (perhaps not every one but the generality of them, as at other meetings) *συνεστῆσαν* congregated or assembled; and it seems to be a good full Congregation, by *Eutychus's* being mounted to the

third

*third loft* (whatever he meant by that *third loft*, though but the *third scaffold*), so high that by a *fall* from thence he was in great danger of being killed. Now it is not likely that such a Congregation of Christians were thus assembled for common eating.

He says, *Paul* was to go away on the *Morrow*. True; But it is not said they came together to take leave of *Paul*; but, came together to Break Bread. *Paul's* going away on the *Morrow*, might be the reason (and I believe was) why they continued there so long: but the *End* for which they came together, was to Break Bread: and the occasion of their so coming, because it was the first day of the Week: On which, it should seem, they were wont to do for that end. And if he candidly consider it, methinks it should seem so to him. *Paul* came to them at *Troas* in five days, where he abode seven days: And on the first day of the Week, when the Disciples came together to break Bread, *Paul* preached to them. Doth not the fair prospect of the place import thus much, that they were then met to break Bread, as being the first day of the week? What other occasion was there of mentioning what day of the Week it was? It had been otherwise a fairer transition to have said, He staid there Seven days, and on the Seventh day, (or the last of those Seven) the Disciples came together to take leave of *Paul* and Sup with him over night, who was to depart on the morrow. Now if it had been said on the Seventh day (though meaning but the last of those Seven) it would no doubt have been urged as a great argument of *Paul's* keeping a Seventh day Sabbath, and the Disciples with him; not as a Jewish but as a Christian Assembly; for breaking of bread (which was a Christian not a Jewish Service;) For then, breaking of bread, would certainly have been the Lords Supper: (But because it was on the first day of the Week) it must now be but common eating, to take leave of *Paul*, and to Sup with him; as (he tells us p. 57.) Friends commonly do (when a Minister or any other special Acquaintance intends to take a Journey in the morning) to sup with him over night. But if he thinks this to be all which is there meant by the Disciples coming together on the first day of the Week to Break Bread; he must excuse me if I cannot be of his Opinion.

But because he is content to admit (upon some terms) their meeting might be upon a Religious account, for the Lords Supper (as no doubt it was) I shall press him no further therein: but accept of his condescension.

When he tells us, that *μία* is Greek for one, and therefore *μία σάββατον* may as well be rendred One day of the Week, as the First

*First day of the Week*: Surely he is not in earnest. Such trifling doth more hurt than help his cause. No doubt, but, when ever they met, it was one day of the Week, we need not be told it; nor need the word *Week* be added, he might as well have said one day; nor need he have said so much. But this Author cannot think (nor doth he) that *μία σάββατον* doth any where signify other than the first day of the Week. In the whole story of Christs Resurrection, and what followed on that day in all the Four Evangelists, we have no other word for it but *μία σάββατον*, nor have we any other word for it (that I know of) there or any where else. I do not know that it is any where called *εσπριν σάββατον*. (Save that what is called *μία σάββατον* Mat. 16. 2. is *μία σάββατον* v. 9. which doth explain the other also.) Such shifting doth not look well.

'Tis somewhat like the Story of a man who bought a Horse for Five pounds to be paid the next day. And accordingly on the next day he sent Five Pounds of Candles. Perhaps (in the Bargain) it was not said expressly (in words at length) Five Pounds of Lawful Money of England. But, by common intendment, it must be so understood. (And an honest English Jury, upon a Tryal, would so Find it.)

The Latin word *Pridie*, is a Derivative (or Compound rather) from *præ*, prior; and *Postridie* from *post*, posterior; and accordingly (in Latin) *pridie Calendarum*, and *postridie Calendarum* must signify a day before, and a day after the Calends. But can any man think it is meant of any day? No, but the next day before, and the next day after.

So if we say, Christ was Crucified one day before the Sabbath, and Rose again one day after the Sabbath. This one day is the next day. And to any man who hath not a mind to Cavil, will understand it. And to *μία σάββατον*, one day after the Sabbath, must needs be understood of the next day after the Sabbath; Nor is it ever used in any other sense. If it were to be understood of any indefinitely, it should be *μία ἡμέρα* some day after the Sabbath, not *μία ἡμέρα* one day after.

But the most pleasant shift of all, is, when he would have us think that this Evening (which is called the first day of the Week) was the Evening after the Seventh day; that is Saturday night; and the next morning (when *Paul* was to go away) was Sunday morning (and he to travel that Sunday:) And that the Evening of Saturday was the beginning of Sunday, and was therefore called the First day of the Week. Because it is said Gen. 1. the Evening and the Morning was the first day (and so of the rest) and

and therefore *the evening was the beginning of every day.* See what shift a man will make, rather than quit an Opinion he hath once taken up.

We are taught that on *the Fourteenth day of the first month at even* the Pass-over was to be killed. Doth he think that this *Fourteenth day at even* was the *end of the Thirteenth day*, the Fourteenth day then *beginning*? I think every body else takes it to be the evening at the end of the Fourteenth day, and the Fifteenth day (on the morrow) was the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. For though it were the *fourteenth day at evening*, yet it was the *fourteenth day*, not the *fifteenth*.

And *Luke 23. 54.* the evening after our Saviours Crucifixion, on the sixth day, when it was *late at night* (as was shewed before and must be, according to the story of what had been done before that time) was yet but *the preparation*, not the Sabbath, the *Seventh day* being not yet begun. For so we have it, *it was the preparation; and the Sabbath drew on.* And the Women were then *preparing their Spices and Ointments*, yet *rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment*; So that the Sabbath day was not yet begun. Nor was it ended when the evening of the next day began, but on the morning of the day following, as was shewed above.

And (as we shewed at large before) the *first day of the Week* (on which Christ rose) began *very early in the morning while it was dark*, and continued (the *same day*) till *very late at night*. And this is the constant Language of the New Testament every where.

So that when the *Congregation of Christians, Acts 20. 7. did on the first day of the Week assemble to break Bread*, and Paul Preached to them, continuing their *Sermon till Mid-night*; this must needs be on what we call *Sunday*; and the morning following was *Monday morning*; not *Sunday morning* as this Author would have it. 'Tis manifest therefore, that there was a *Religious Assembly*, of the Christian Congregation at *Troas*, on the *First day of the Week*, for celebration of the *Lords Supper*, and *Preaching*; and Paul with them. Which I take to be the celebration of a Christian Sabbath.

However, this (he says) is but *One Instance*. True, this is but one. (But we have heard of more before, and shall hear of more by and by.) But *this one* is more than he can shew for more than *Two Thousand Five Hundred Years* (from God's resting on the Seventh day *Gen. 2. 3.* till after *Israel* was come out of *Egypt* *Ex. 16.* during which time he would have us think the Seventh day

day Sabbath was constantly observed. And if he could shew any *one* such instance (of *Enoch, Noah, Abraham*, or others,) where such a *Religious Assembly*, for the Worship of God, was held on *the seventh day in course from the Creation*; he would think his point well proved, though no more were said of it than is of this.

Whereas now as to the time from thence to the Flood, he brings no other proof, but that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah* were good men (as no doubt they were) and therefore it is to be presumed *they kept a Sabbath*; and that upon the *seventh day*. Which is to *beg* the question, not to *prove* it.

From thence till *Israel* going into *Egypt*, all that he brings to prove this matter of fact is but that of *Gen. 13. 6.* where (speaking of *Abram* and *Lot*, with the multitude of their Cattel) it is said, *the land was not able to bear them that they might Dwell together*; for *their substance was great so that they could not Dwell together*; and there was a *strife between the Herd-men of Abrams Cattle, and the Herd-men of Lots Cattle, &c.* They could not Dwell together, that is (saith he) they could not *Rest* together; that is, they could not keep a Sabbath together; therefore (he concludes) they did *use* to keep a Sabbath; and that Sabbath was *the seventh day in course from the Creation*. And is not this a goodly proof? I should think (if he would put a stress on the word *Rest*) it should rather signify, they could not *live quietly* together without their *herd-mens quarrelling* about their Pasture; for so it follows in the next words, *there was a strife between their herd-mens*.

From thence till after their coming out of *Egypt*, he brings no other proof but that of *Ex. 5. 4, 5.* Where, when *Moses* and *Aaron* had been pressing *Pharaoh* to let *Israel* go *three days Journey into the Wilderness*, to keep a *Feast and Sacrifice to the Lord their God*; *Pharaoh* replies, *Wherefore do ye Let (or hinder) the People from their Work: you make them Rest from their Burdens, or you take them off from their Work*; that is, says he, *you make them keep a Sabbath*. For the Word or Verb there Translated *you make them Rest* is, (he tells us) a derivative from another Verb which signifies *to Rest*, from which Verb the word Sabbath is also derived: They did therefore *Rest* (saith he) that is *keep a Sabbath*, and that Sabbath was *every Week*, and it was on *the seventh day in course from the Creation*.

Alas! how little do either or both of these places prove, of what he would have to be granted him thence! He tells us sometimes there were other *Sabbaths*, besides that of the *seventh day*; I am sure there were other *Restings*. E If

If *Moses and Aaron* had desired *Pharaoh* to excuse them from their Work *one day in seven*, that on such day they might serve the Lord their God; it would have looked like an Argument. But when it is, *to go three days into the Wilderness to keep a Feast to the Lord*; what is this to a *Weekly Sabbath*?

This *Seventh-day-sabbath*, so runs in the mind of this Author that if any where he can lay hold of the word *Rest*, it must presently prove a *Seventh-day-sabbath*. Else who would have thought, that because *Abram* and *Lot* could not dwell quietly together; therefore they must needs keep a *Sabbath*, and that upon the *seventh* day, and in course from the *Creation*? And the like of the *Israelites in Egypt*, because *Moses* and *Aaron* are said to *hinder* them from their Work; Therefore they did constantly keep a weekly *Sabbath*, and that upon the *seventh* day, in course from the *Creation*.

He might have to better purpose, alledg'd *Pharaoh's seven fat kine and seven lean ones*, and the *seven full ears of Corn*, and *seven empty*; for here we have the number *seven* signalized; only these were *Seven Years*, not *Seven Days*; and the like of *Nebuchadnezzar's* being *seven years* turned out to the *Beasts of the field*, *Dan. 4. 25, 32, 33.* Or that of the *Clean Beasts and Fowls* coming into the Ark by *sevens*, *Gen. 7. 2, 3.*

But, what is more to his purpose (and which he should not have missed) is that of *Gen. 7. 4.* and *Gen. 8. 10, 12.* where we have the interval of *seven days* particularly mentioned; *For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the Earth, &c.* (*Chap. 7. 4.*) where God gives to *Noah* just a *Weeks* warning of the time when the Flood should begin, during which interval (if those days were Sabbath days) he might remove himself and what was necessary into the Ark before the next Sabbath. And, toward the end of the Flood, *Noah* sends out the *Dove*, *Chap. 8. 8.* *And he staid seven days, and again sent forth the Dove*, *ver. 10.* *And he staid yet other seven days, and sent forth the Dove, &c.* *ver. 12.* Where we have the *Dove* sent out three times, just at *seven days* distance. And how do we know but that these *three days* were three *Sabbath days*? Which though it be not a conclusive Argument, is better than any that he brings. For here we have three *Intervals of seven days*, in these two Chapters.

But if a *Weekly Sabbath* were then kept, 'tis very strange that we should have no intimation of any such thing in the books of *Moses* (before *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*.) And much more, that there is nothing of it in the Book of *Job*. And, that none of

of his friends (amongst the many charges they bring against him) should never object his *Neglect of the Sabbath*, or want of *due observance* thereof. Which being so plausible an objection, it seems more likely, that a Sabbath was not then wont to be observed: for which he hath so very little to shew. And by what we have *Job 1. 4.* It should seem that *Job's Seven Sons* kept *Feasting* (each in his own day) for *Seven days together*; without any mention of a Sabbath intervening. Nor was it a *Religious Feast*, but a Feast of mirth and jollity, such as made *Job* suspicious lest they might sin and curse God in their hearts, *v. 5.* And therefore he offer'd propitiatory *Sacrifices for them continually*, or (as the Margin tells us it is in the Hebrew) *all the days*; that is every of these *Seven days*.

As little a matter will serve his turn to prove (*p. 43.*) that *Christ's Ascension* was, and his coming to Judgment is to be, on a *Saturday*, or *Seventh-day-Sabbath*: Because it is said *Acts 1. 12.* that *Mount Olivet* (whence he ascended) is, from *Jerusalem*, a *Sabbath-days Journey*.

But he tells us that *by no account that he can make, can he assign the Ascension on the First day*, (No more can I.) But what then?

Well! But why upon a *Saturday* rather than a *Sunday*? Because he observes, that after *Christ's Ascension* from *Mount Olivet*, it is said, *Then they returned to Jerusalem from Mount Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a Sabbath-days Journey.* Well! what of this? *He cannot see why it was expressly said, that it was but a Sabbath-days Journey from Jerusalem, but because it was the Sabbath-day.*

Perhaps I may shew him another reason as likely as it. If the word *then* do not there signify *the same day* (but only at large, after his *Ascension*) this is nothing to the purpose. But admitting that by *then* he meant *the same day*; the connexion runs fairly thus, *After his Ascension they returned from thence to Jerusalem the same day, for it was (i.e., v.) but a little way off, about a Sabbath-days Journey.* Which, I think, is a fair account of the place; Especially since we know otherwise, that it was not upon a Sabbath day.

Again, if this (of a *Sabbath-days Journey*) should intimate, it was on a Sabbath day; why on a *Seventh* day, rather than a *First* day? and why upon no account upon the *First*? For, if the *First* day were then a Sabbath (as we think it was) that of *not traveling more than a Sabbath-days Journey*, would as well respect a *First-days Sabbath*, as a *Seventh-days Sabbath*. So that he is not at all advanced hereby to his *Seventh day Sabbath*; The same

*Account* (as he speaks) will serve as well for the one as for the other. But, indeed, for neither.

But how doth this concern his *Coming to Judgment*? Yes, Because it is there said (ver. 11.) *He shall come in like manner (or return) as ye have seen him go into Heaven.* And (because this Author fancies) he did *Ascend* on a Sabbath day, therefore (he fancies also) he shall on a Sabbath day *come again*. I see a *Weak Argument*, with a *strong Fancy* will go far.

But to prove his *Ascension* to be on the Sabbath (besides this, of a Sabbath-days Journey) he adds further, That *Christ and his Disciples were then Assembled* and that *Christ Preached*. Well! And why may we not as well conclude that the day of his *Resurrection* was also a Sabbath? For *Christ and his Disciples were then Assembled*, (first at *Emmaus*, and then at *Jerusalem*;) and *Christ did then also* (at both places) *Preach to them*, and the substance of his *Preaching* was much the same, (as will appear by comparing *Luk. 24.* with *Acts 1.*) and did then also *Celebrate the Lords Supper*. And *eight days after*, *Christ was again Assembled* with the *Disciples*, and *Preached to them*, on the same day of the Week. If *Christ's Presence and Preaching* will prove the *Ascension* day to be a Sabbath, why should it not as well prove the *Resurrection* day to be a Sabbath? the onely difference is, That (he thinks) serves his turn, But this makes against him.

And why should it not also be thought a Sabbath, *Acts 20.* For *Paul and the Disciples were then Assembled*; and they were assembled to *break Bread*; and *Paul there Preached to them*. And all these Assemblies were on the *first day of the Week*. And they seem to me a much stronger proof of the *First* day (the day of his *Resurrection*) being a Sabbath, than that the *Ascension* day was so.

And the *Preaching* which our Author here mentions as on the day of *Ascension*, seems to me rather to have been on that of the *Resurrection*. For *St. Luke* in the beginning of this Chapter of *Acts 1.* seems to give a short repetition of what himself had delivered more at large *Luk. 24.* And gives an account not only of what happened on the day of *Ascension*, (though he close with it) but of what happened during the *forty days* from his *Resurrection* to that time. And this *Preaching*, I take to be that mentioned *Luke 24.* on the day of his *Resurrection*.

But (after all) this is but a Whimsy, (what he tells us of *Christ's Ascension* on a *Seventh-day Sabbath*.) For 'tis very plain that his *Ascension* was neither on a *seventh* day, nor on a *first*, but on a *fifth* day of the Week. For 'tis plainly said, *Acts 1. 3.*

That

That he shewed himself alive after his *Passion*, being seen of them *Forty days*, (that is, he was seen of them at times, not constantly, for the space of *Forty* days) whereof that of his *Resurrection* was the first, and that of his *Ascension* was the last. And if that were *Sunday*, this must be *Thursday*. He may tell it upon his fingers (as he speaks *p. 5.*) if he please.

But though our Saviours *Ascension* was not on the *seventh* day of the Week (in observance of the *Seventh-day Sabbath*, or in confirmation thereof:) Yet the mission of the *Holy Ghost* (according as on the *First* day of the Week, the day of his *Resurrection*, he had promised. *Luk. 24. 49.*) was on the *first* day of the Week fulfilled also, as appears *Acts 2.* When the day of *Pentecost* was fully come, that is, the *Fiftieth* day (for so *Pentecost* signifieth in Greek) they were all with one accord in one place (that is, they were unanimously assembled) and suddenly there came a sound from Heaven, as of a rushing mighty Wind, and filled the house, where they were sitting; And there appeared to them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them (that is, at least, upon each of the Apostles,) and they were all filled with the *Holy Ghost*, and began to speak with other Tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. Which I take to be a further instance, (if our Author will not allow it to be called a Sabbath,) at least of a *Religious Assembly* for the *Worship of God*; (And if it had been on the *seventh* day, how great a proof would this have been with him for a *Seventh-day Sabbath*.) This I take to be a *Christian Sabbath*, and within the prospect of the *Fourth Commandment*. And though it be not expressly called a Sabbath (to avoid confusion or ambiguity, because the word *Sabbath* in common speech was then appropriated to the Jewish Sabbath,) yet it is the same thing.

And if he doubt whether the Feast of *Pentecost* were on the *First* day of the Week, as was that of the *Resurrection*; he may be satisfied from *Levit. 23. 15.* where that Feast is appointed. After mention made of the *Pass-over*, (ver. 5. &c.) *Moses* proceeds to that of the *Wave-offering*, v. 10, 11. When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof; then shall ye bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the Priest, and he shall Wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you; on the morrow after the Sabbath the Priest shall wave it.

Whether by the Sabbath here mentioned be meant the *Weekly Sabbath*, or the *first* day of the Feast of *Unleavened-Bread*, is not material; because, in that year whereof we are speaking, this *first* day of the Feast was on the *Weekly Sabbath*, (as is manifest from

from the story of Christs Crucifixion, which was on the Sixth day of the Week, and the next day (being the Seventh day) was the Feast of the Pass-over; and the morrow after this Sabbath, was the day of Christs Resurrection, as well of the Wave-offering. And then he proceeds, ver. 15, 16, to the Feast of Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks. *Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the Wave-offering, seven Sabbaths shall be compleat, even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath, shall ye number Fifty days* (inclusively taken, as the manner is in Scripture reckoning, and must needs be so here.) It was called the Feast of Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks (as Deut. 16. 9, 10.) which Feast of Pentecost was the morrow after the Sabbath, on a first day of the Week.

And on this first day of the Week, (the morrow after the seventh day Sabbath) here was a solemn Assembly for Religious Worship, and a very large one, both of Jews and Gentiles out of every nation under Heaven, Parthians, Medes, Elamites, &c. And this solemnized by a Miraculous Effusion of the Holy Ghost, in the gift of Tongues: For we all hear (say those of that great Assembly) every one in our own Tongue wherein we were born the wonderful Works of God, ver. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. With a long Sermon of Peter's on that occasion. Which I take to be another celebration of the First-day Sabbath; and a very eminent one.

We are to observe also, that in some of the places alleged to this purpose, though but single instances, there is an intimation of a frequent usage. As in that Act. 20. 7. *On the first day of the week, the disciples being assembled to break bread, Paul preached, &c.* Is a fair intimation, that on the first day they did use so to assemble.

If it were said amongst us, *About six a clock, when they were come together (in the College-Hall) to supper, such a thing happened: Any (unprejudiced) person would take it for a fair intimation, that they used to sup about six a clock.* And if this Author could any where find, in the book of Job, that *On the seventh day of the week* (from the Creation) when Job and his friends were assembled for the joint service of God, Bildad spake thus, &c. He would take this for a strong proof, that the seventh-day Sabbath was then wont to be observed. Much stronger than what he allegeth to that purpose, *Abram and Lot had each of them so many Cattel, that they could not dwell (or rest) together, without quarrellings amongst their servants.* And that of what Pharaoh said to Moses and Aaron, *Why do you hinder their work, you make the people Rest from their burthens?*

A like place is that of 1 Cor. 16. 1, 2. *Now concerning the Collection*

*lection for the Saints, as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye: (and what that was, we are told in the next words,) Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.* (If it had been so said to Noah, to Abraham, or to Job, Upon the seventh day of the week do thus or thus; what a strong proof would this have been for the Observation of a seventh day Sabbath!)

I think it is plain from hence, that the First day of the week, was weekly observed; and was wont to be observed, both by the Church of Corinth, and by the Churches of Galatia. For St. Paul doth not here advise it, but suppose it, or take it for granted.

What that order was to the Churches of Galatia our Author says he cannot tell. I thought it had been plain enough: he bids the Corinthians do, as he bid the Galatians; that is, on the First day of the Week, &c. What further order, he had given the Galatians, it is not as to this point necessary for us to know.

But saith he, if they must on that day lay by as God hath blessed them, then they must on that day cast up their accounts, tell their money, reckon their stock, compute their expenses, &c. which are not Sabbath-day Works. A wise objection? As though all this could not as well be done before (so far as is necessary) and, on Sunday, put so much into the poor mans box (or give to the Deacons or Collectors) as (upon such account) they should have found it; like as is now done in our Churches when there is occasion for such Collections.

Why doth he not make the same exception to that of Deut. 16. 10. concerning the Feast of Pentecost? where they are to bring a tribute of a free-will-offering, which (says he) thou shalt give unto the Lord thy God, &c. according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee; Doth he think that on the day of Pentecost (which was to be strictly observed as a Sabbath, a holy Convocation and no servile work to be done, Lev. 23, 31.) they must cast up their accounts, tell their money, &c. because they were to offer according as the Lord hath blessed them? I think not.

But here comes in again his former trifling objection of *the first day of the Week*. Yet I am very confident, himself doth really believe it doth here so signify, and (as to his own thoughts) doth not doubt of it. But perhaps thinks it a piece of wit, or skill in Greek, thus to object against his own judgment. Yet since he will have it so, (and we must come again to Childs play,) I will say somewhat to it.

Whether

Whether *μία σαββατων* be good Greek or no, as to the common analogy of that Tongue; or, what is the reason of that Syntax; I need not trouble my self to enquire, (because it is nothing to the purpose; for we are not inquiring whether it be good Greek, but what it here signifies.) There are I presume in all Languages (by negligence or corruption) some harsh expressions, as to the analogy of the Language, which yet are allowable by common usage, and well enough understood.

He would think it perhaps a little harsh to say in Greek *τρεσκαίδέκα*, *παραδεκάβητος*, (that is in Latine, *tres & decimum*, *quatuor & decimum*,) for what we say in English *thirteenth*, *fourteenth*; yet so they speak. And somewhat harsh *δεννὴν δεκά αὐτῶν* *Rev. 2. 26.* *Rev. 3. 21.* and *δεννὴν παραδεκά αὐτῶν*, *Rev. 3. 12.* (instead of *τρεκαίδέκα*, *παραδεκάβητος*;) yet so it is. And *ἐν τῇ ὥρῃ* *Rev. 1. 4.* And many such may be shewed.

In Latine, *idcirco*, *quocirca*, *posthac*, *quapropter*, *controvertor*, *paterfamilias*, *omne genus homines*, *Aethiops albus dentes*, *pridie calendas*, and many more, are scarce to be accounted for as regular, save that they are so used; but, because they are so used, they are accounted elegant enough.

In English; *Methinks* (for *I think*) *three pound ten shillings*, (for *three pounds*, &c.) *three foot nine inches*, *many a one*, *a few Pottage*, and the like, are scarce regular; yet are so used. When a Merchant marks his Parcels (and so calls them) *number one*, *number two*, &c. he means *first* and *second*. So, in the Year of our Lord *one thousand six hundred and ninety one*, *One thousand six hundred ninety two*, is commonly said; when yet we mean *ninety first*, *ninety second*; so *one a clock*, *two a clock*, for the *first* and *second* hour after Twelve. And other the like cases, where the Cardinal number is put for the Ordinal. As it is also in *Gen. 1. The evening, and morning were (jorn ecbad) day one*; which the Septuagint renders *ἡμέρα μία*, and *μία* doth there signify *ἑξῆς*. Yet no wise man will cavil as to the sense of such expressions, (what ever they may do as to the Grammatical construction,) when we know what is meant by them.

So here, 'tis true *μία* doth properly signify *one* in common construction: but *μία σαββατων* doth never signify other than *the first day of the week*, (either in the New Testament or any where else,) not *any day of the week*, any more than *one a clock* doth signify any other hour than the *first* after *twelve*. When a thing is said to be done at *one a clock*; he that shall object, this may be *any hour*, for every

every hour is *one*; would be laugh'd at. And when a Merchant bids his Prentice bring him *number one*, if he bring him what else he pleases (because every number, is *number one*, or *one number*) he deserveth to be knockt.

Now when every one knows (who understands any thing of this nature,) that *μία σαββατων* is the proper name of that day which is next after the Jewish Sabbath, as much as *one a clock* is the proper name of that hour which is next after Twelve: it must either be great ignorance, or somewhat worse so to object. I appeal to himself, whether ever he met with that name (in any Author) in any other sense.

He seems to take it very unkindly, pag. 66 of those who should think that, by *son of man* should be meant an ordinary Man, in *Mar. 2. 27, 28.* *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.* Where I think it is plain, that in the former verse (*the Sabbath was made for Man*, &c.) it is manifestly spoken of ordinary Men. And though in the latter verse, (*the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath*,) by *Son of Man* I suppose is meant Christ; yet is that Title given also to ordinary Men, elsewhere, very often. As *Job. 25. 6.* *How much less Man who is a Worm, and the Son of Man who is a Worm?* And *Isai. 51. 12.* *Who art thou that shouldst be afraid of a Man that shall die, and of the Son of Man which shall be made as Grass.* So *Pf. 8. 4.* *What is Man, that thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man that thou visitest him?* And to the same purpose, *Pf. 144. 3.* And (to name no more) in the Book of *Ezekiel*, the Prophet *Ezekiel* is, in that one Book, called *Son of Man*, oftner than Christ is so called in the whole Bible. And if we would argue as he doth, we might plausibly object, It might be so meant here, though I think it is not. But he cannot shew that ever the Jewish Sabbath was called *the Lords day* (however he thinks it might have been;) nor (though *μία* be Greek for *One*) that *μία σαββατων* is ever used for other than the first day of the week, or the next after the Jewish Sabbath. Nor doth he think it. Such trifling (to give it no harder name) may do well enough in Drollery or Burlesque, but not in a plain honest Enquiry.

But if he would be curious as to the Phrase; 'tis plain enough that *σαββατων* is not properly the Genitive case governed of *μία*. For then it should have been *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, because *μία* is of the Neuter Gender. (And 'tis a mistake therefore when p. 58. he renders it by *One of the Sabbaths*, as if it had been *ἐν σαββατων*.) But 'tis governed rather of some Preposition or Particle understood, (as *ἐν* or the like,) and then, as in Latin *pridie calendas* (that is,

*prior dies ante calendas*) is the next day before the Calends: so is *μία οὐββатар* (or *μία ἀπο οὐββатар*) the next day after the Sabbath: The full construction is *μία ἡμέρα ἀπο οὐββатар*, (the word *ἡμέρα* being understood in the word *μία*, and *ἀπο* understood in the word *οὐββатар*.) That is *one day after the Sabbath*, which being the proper Name of a day, cannot be meant of any other but the Next day after.

'Tis certain therefore that (*μία οὐββатар*) the first day of the Week, or the first day after the Jewish Sabbath, was from the Resurrection of Christ and after, eminently signalized as a day of special Observation; 'Twas honoured with Christs Resurrection on that day; with his first appearance to Mary Magdalen and the other Women; then, to the Two Disciples going to Emmaus, and his Religious Assembly with them there; after that, to the Disciples at Jerusalem and assembling with them the same day; and the whole time of those Assemblings employed in Religious Exercises, (Preaching, Celebrating the Lords Supper, Instructing and Blessing his Disciples, and giving them Commission for Preaching the Gospel and Planting the Christian Church.) And again with the same Disciples on that day *sen-night*, assembled with them, and in like manner employed. It was specially signalized also by the Miraculous Effusion of the Holy Ghost on that day, in a great assembly of Jews and Gentiles on the day of Pentecost; and the day employed in Preaching and other Religious exercises. It was observed in like manner at Troas, in preaching the Word, Celebrating the Lords Supper, and other Religious Communion, as things there usual on that day. It was observed at Corinth, not once onely, but as a thing of course; and so presumed by the Apostle when he gives particular Instructions concerning a Collection for the Saints to be made weekly on that day. And in like manner in the Churches of Galatia, with a like direction to them. (And we have no reason to suspect but that in other Churches also, there was a like custome of observing that day.) And it is the onely day of the week (unless the Seventh-day, in order to the Jewish Sabbath) that is so much as Mentioned by name after the Resurrection of Christ. (At least I do not at present remember the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth day of the week by name so mentioned.) Now what we have reason to believe was so generally observed after the Resurrection, by Christ himself (more than once,) by his Apostles, and by the Christian Churches in their days; we have reason to believe was according to Christs direction. For we know very well, that

Christ

Christ did after his resurrection give commandments to the Apostles, about things pertaining unto the kingdom of God, and settling the Christian Church. What those Commandments were in particular, we cannot tell; but are to presume that what they did therein, was pursuant of those commands; and this in particular about observing the first day of the week, which we call the Christian Sabbath; and which (in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath) is called the Lords day; Rev. i. 10. And hath accordingly been so called, and so observed ever since. Which being so practised by the Apostles, and so continued ever since, I take to be a good warrant for us to continue it, as a thing agreeable to the Will of God.

As to what he so often objects, that there is no express command thereof recorded: that is, not such a command as our Author demands. We are not to prescribe to God in what terms he shall make known his Will, (any more than the Pharisees, Mat. 16. 4. were to prescribe to Christ what kind of signs he was to shew to testify his authority;) 'tis sufficient if God do in his own way intimate what is his Will, though it be not with the formality of *Be it Enacted*. And those who are willing to be taught of God, will be content so to understand his meaning. An approved Practise in the Worship of God, frequently Repeated, attested by Miracles, encouraged by Christs own Example, and that of the Apostles and the Christian Churches then, and continued in the Christian Church ever since: Is to me great evidence of the will of God; and that there was a command for it, though it be not recorded. (Like as I believe that there was, very early, a command from God, to worship him by Sacrifice, though that command be not recorded.)

But (to that of its being so observed ever since) he objects, we have nothing but Tradition, either that the Christian Sabbath hath been so observed, or that it is called the Lords-day. And Tradition is what he takes great pleasure to exclaim against; If that be admitted (saith he) where shall we stop?

Very well! I am not over fond of laying too great a weight upon Traditions; at least not on all things that are pretended so to be. But, I pray, How can he tell, otherwise than by Tradition, whether our Saturday or our Sunday, be the Seventh day in course from the Creation? Or, (if that be too hard a question) whether of the two is the Seventh day of the Jewish week, I know nothing but Tradition for it. I cannot remember so long: Nor have I so long kept so strict account of days as to be sure of it. I trust to the common Computation of the world, that our Sab-

bath is a continuation of that Sabbath which the Apostles kept. And if so, I am safe. If not, I cannot help it. And because I think the Apostles Sabbath was on the first day of the Jewish week, therefore I think ours to be so. But if theirs was not, neither is ours.

He would not have that of St. John, Revel. 1. 10. *I was in the Spirit on the Lords day* to be understood of our Sabbath. And why not? He tells us, 1. Some think it to be *Christmas-day*; 2. Some think it to be *Easter-day*; and 3. Some think it to be the *Day of Judgment*. And long Discourses we have upon all these. Well! But doth he think it to be meant of any of these? No. Then, to what purpose are these alleged, in disparagement of the Christian Sabbath?

But he seems to have so great displeasure against the *Christian Sabbath*, that whatever he can think of to be Objected (though he do not think it to be true) he will be sure to Object, (that he may disparage the day, or perplex the Argument) as if he were more concerned to beat down the *Christian Sabbath*, than to set up the *Jewish*. Not considering, that, by all this, he is doing their Work who would have none at all. For they know well that the *Jewish Sabbath* hath been long since laid aside (without any great fear of returning;) and if they can but throw off the *Christian Sabbath* also, 'tis what they would have. And 'tis of a like import what he argues (p. 84.) for coming to the publick but once a day, (not twice as our manner is;) For those who care not to come at all, if he dispence with them as to the One, they will dispence with themselves as to the Other meeting.

I should rather think, that, the whole day being due to the Service of God (publick and private) it is to be parcelled out, as to the number and times of publick meeting; as might (according to Christian Prudence) be judged most conducing (in this or that place) to those ends, and to common Edification; and that, to make such little Circumstances (otherwise than as they conduce to those general ends) a matter of *Religious Observation*, or *Divine Institution*, is a like extravagance as that of the Pharisees in laying like weight on their Traditions, and that of the Papists on their numerous Superstitious Ceremonies. And is as properly *superstition*, as these.

I do not know this Author, (who thus argues against observing the Christian Sabbath, and against publick meeting on that day more than once;) And therefore am not willing to judge hardly. But the natural result of what he argues, is as I told you.

He

He doth not think that John, was (on the *Lords day* Revel. 1. 10.) keeping the Anniversary of Christs Incarnation; nor of his Resurrection. (No more do I.) But why not? Because (saith he) *he may say as in the case of Moses's dead body, No man knows of his Sepulchre to this day.* Now as to the Incarnation, I am apt to think, that no man doth At this day know certainly, either on what day of the Year, or what day of the Week Christ was born (nor is it any matter whether we do or no.) But I should rather say, no man knows At this day, than (as he) no man knoweth To this day, (as if no man hitherto had known it:) for certainly there have been those who knew it heretofore (while he was alive) though it be now forgotten, and at this day no man knows it. But will he say so as to the Resurrection? I think it is plain, that Christ was Crucified on the fourteenth day, lay in the Grave the fifteenth, and rose again the sixteenth day, of the first month. And that he rose on the first day of the week, no man doubts. He should rather have put it thus, *As no man knows To this day, where is the Body of Moses*, (that it might not be worshiped,) *So no man knows At this day, which is the Seventh in course from the Creation*; that we might not contend about it.

However, I am contented to admit, (if that will please him) that the *Lords day* there mention'd was neither meant of *Christmas-day*, nor *Easter-day*, nor *Whit-sunday*, nor the day of Judgment; but think it to be meant of the first day of the week, which is the *Christian Sabbath*. Not, of any of those other days mentioned; nor of the *Jewish Sabbath*, as he would have it.

'Tis, I think, a new notion of his own (at least I know none other of his mind) that it should be meant of the *Jewish Sabbath*. He grants there is nothing from the Circumstances of the place to determine it to this day. Nor doth he pretend to shew that the *Jewish Sabbath* was ever so called. But he thinks it might have been so called. For he says *God blessed and sanctified the seventh day* (that is, the Seventh day after Six days of Labour) therefore it might have been called the *Lords day*; and so may as well the *Christian Sabbath* as the *Jews Sabbath*. That the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath day; And so is he of every day in the Week; and of the *Christian Sabbath* (when that is the Sabbath) as well as of the *Jewish*. That the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord our God; that is, the Seventh day after Six days of Labour; but whether the Seventh day in course from the Creation, is no where said. That *Mat. 5. 13.* The Sabbath is called my holy

*holy day*: True, on what ever day the Sabbath be: First or Seventh of the Week; or whatever day God appoints to be kept *Holy*; As for instance, *the first and seventh day of the Feast of Unleavened bread*, Ex. 12. 16. The *First* day shall be a *Holy Convocation*; and the *Seventh* day shall be a *Holy Convocation*; and each of them was *the Lords Holy day*, on what ever day of the week they happened. And the like for other days. So *Levit. 23. 2, 4, 8, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 36, 39.* and *Num. 28. 18, 25, 26. Num. 29. 1, 7, 12, 35.* All the days here mentioned are *the Lords Holy days*, yet I do not take any of them to be *the Lords day*. And all he can pretend to from these or whatever he produceth, is no more but that the *Jewish Sabbath* (while it was the Sabbath) might have been so called, *and the Lords day*; he doth not pretend to shew that ever it was so called.

Now I would desire this Gentleman (if he can but a little while lay aside his prejudice) to consider, first that *the Lords day* was the proper name of a day; whereby it might be known as distinguished from other days; (else to what purpose is it said *I was in the spirit on the Lords day*;) whereas the proper name of the *Jewish Sabbath* (and of that onely as he would have us think p. 64.) was the *Sabbath day*; and there is no appearance of reason, why, if he meant that day, he should not rather have said *I was in the spirit on the Sabbath day, or the seventh day.* This therefore must needs be meant of some other day, known by another name.

2. I would have him next consider, the *the Lord* in the Old Testament is the usual name of *God* indefinitely; without particularizing this or that of the Three Persons; and *the Sabbath of the Lord thy God*, doth not appropriate it to the second Person more than to the first and third. And though I do not deny, that our *Lord Christ* was the *God* who gave the Ten Commandments (for all the three Persons are the same *God*;) yet I do not think it to be *Christ* onely, as contradistinguished to the other two. And when it is said, *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other God but me*; the meaning is not, I the second Person, am so the *Lord thy God*, that thou shalt own no other Person for thy *God* beside me the second Person. But *the Lord*, in the New Testament, is for the most part applied peculiarly to our *Lord Christ* (*God and Man*;) and is understood of him. (As he is called elsewhere *the Son of Man*;) And accordingly *the Lords day* must be a day peculiarly appropriate to our *Lord Christ*; which the Jews Sabbath was not, nor that of the Fourth Commandment: which

which is the Sabbath of the *Lord thy God*, that is of *God* indefinitely; for 'tis in that notion that *God* speaks in the Ten Commandments, not as one person contradistinguished to the other two.

It is *the Lords day* in a like sense, as *the Lords Supper*, 1 Cor. 11. 20. and *the Cup of the Lord, the Table of the Lord*, 1 Cor. 10. 21, 22. 1 Cor. 11. 27. In all which, by *the Lord*, is meant the *Lord Christ*, *God and Man*. And because, there being a double Sabbath then in use, (the *Jewish Sabbath*, and the *Christian Sabbath*;) and the word *Sabbath* indefinitely having been a long time applied to the *Jewish Sabbath*, and would be apt to be understood of it; therefore (by way of distinction) that of the Christians (though a *Sabbath* also, within the sense of the Fourth Commandment) was called *the Lords day*, as being the Day or Sabbath appropriate to our *Lord Jesus Christ*. And therefore when he tells us, so often, the World was made by our *Lord Jesus Christ*; and the Law given on Mount Sinai by our *Lord Jesus Christ*, (upon which Notions he seems to lay great stress, though it be nothing to the purpose,) I think it is a mistake. For our *Lord Jesus Christ* is *God and Man*, but he was not *God and Man* when the World was made, or the Law given, but onely *God*. 'Tis true *Christ* as *God*, (according to his Divine Nature) is the same *God* who made the World, and gave the Law, (for we have no other *God* but one) but not as *God and Man*. For *Man* he was not at that time, but in the fullness of time became *Man*. The Sabbath of the *Lord our God* (in the Fourth Commandment, with equal respect to all the Three Persons) doth not signify the same as, The Sabbath of our *Lord Jesus Christ* (*God and Man*.) The *Lord our God* there, not the same with our *Lord Jesus Christ*, in the New Testament. But *the Lords Supper* is the *Supper of the Lord Jesus Christ* (*God and Man*;) the Founder of our Christian Religion: And accordingly *the Lords day* is the day of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, a day appointed by him.

3. I would have him consider further, that *the Lords day*, (*dominica*, or *dies dominicus*,) hath been all along in all ages of the Christian Church, used as the proper name of what we otherwise call the *Christian Sabbath*; and not for the proper name of any other day; and therefore, till somewhat do appear to the contrary, I shall take it to be the same with what is called *the Lords day* in Scripture.

There is, in the New Testament, a place called *Rome*; and there at this day a place in *Italy* called *Rome*, and which hath been so called all along ever since; neither do I know of any other eminent

ment place so called. Therefore (till somewhat do appear to the contrary) I shall presume our *Rome* to be the same place with that which in the New Testament is called *Rome*.

We find in scripture there is an Island of the Mediterranean Sea called *Melita* or *Malta* (where St. Paul suffered Ship-wrack) not far from another Island called *Cretæ*. Now we know also there is in the Mediterranean Sea an Island called *Malta* at this day, and another not far from thence called *Crete* or *Candy*, and we do not know of any other Islands so called, then or at any time since; and therefore we may safely presume (till somewhat do appear to the contrary) that those Islands now so called, are the same Islands with those which were then so called.

And in like manner, that Day which hath been ever since called *the Lords-day* as by its proper name, we may and ought to presume to be the same day which was by St. John so called (as by its proper name) in *Rev. i. 10.* when he wrote the Book of the Revelation; till it can be shewed that he did by that name mean some other day.

And we have the more reason so to presume, because we find it so called by others, very soon after St. John's time; and by those whom we have great reason to believe to have been well acquainted with St. John's meaning and his manner of speech.

The first I shall name is St. Ignatius, who was not onely contemporary with St. John, but was a Disciple or Scholar of St. John. Now St. John (according to the best account we can have from Chronology) wrote his Revelation in *Patmos* (whither he was banished by *Domitian*), in or about the year of our Lord 96; (after which he wrote his Gospel, upon his return from *Patmos* to *Ephesus*;) And died in the Year 98 or 99 under *Trajanus*. And Ignatius died a Martyr under the same Emperor *Trajan*, in the Year of our Lord 107. So that there is no great distance in time. (And if we should miss a Year or two it is not material.) How long before his death Ignatius wrote his Epistle to the *Magnesian*s, we are not sure (nor is it material;) Now in that his Epistle to the *Magnesian*s; even according to the genuine Edition published by Bishop *Usher* out of an ancient Manuscript (not that which is justly suspected to be interpolated,) he doth earnestly exhort them not to Judaize, but to live as *Christians*; (*Si enim usque hunc secundum Judaismum vivimus; confitemur gratiam non recepisse.*) And as to the Sabbath in particular, *Non amplius Sabbatizantes, sed secundum Dominicam viventes, in qua & vita nostra ortu est.*) Not any longer observing the Jewish Sabbath, but the *Lords Day*.

Day on which Christ our Life rose again. It is manifest therefore, that within 8 or 10 years after St. John's writing, *the Lords day* did not signify the Jewish Sabbath, but the first day of the week, on which our Saviour Rose again; and that it was then observed in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath. I forbear to mention his Epistle ad *Trallianos* (where again we have *κυριακή* applied to the first day of the week on which Christ rose again) because it is in that Edition which is suspected to be interpolated.

I might to this add the Testimony of *Polycarp*, who was also a Disciple of St. John, and collected and published these Epistles of *Ignatius*; and may be presumed to understand what St. John meant by *the Lords day*.

But I shall add in the next place that of *Justin Martyr*; whom though I cannot call a Disciple of St. John, (because he was not converted to the Christian Religion till about the Year of our Lord 129, about Thirty years after St. John's Death,) yet he lived so soon after, that he could not be ignorant of the Christians Practice, and what they understood St. John to mean by *the Lords Day*. And how that day was observed in *Justin's* time, he tells us in (what is called) his *Second Apology*, *Τὴ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κυριακῇ πάντων τῶν πόλεως ἡ ἀρχὴς μνημονεύει ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸ σωτῆρος γένεαι, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀναγιγνώσκειν* and a little after *καὶ ὅτι ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἡ πᾶσις ἡ σωτῆρος πύρισμα ἐπειδὴ ὡς ἐστὶν, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὸ ἔλεος ἡγήσατο, κόσμον ἐποίησε καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμῶν σωτὴς, τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη.* *Or that day commonly called Sunday, there is held a Congregation or a general Meeting together, of all Inhabitants whether of City or Country, and there are publicly read the Memorials or Monuments of the Apostles, or the Writings of the Prophets, &c.* And again, *The day called Sunday we do all in common make & συνέλευσιν the Meeting-day; for that the First-day is it on which God from Darknes and Matter made the World, and our Saviour Christ did on the same day rise from the dead.* In which places though it be not called *dominica*, but *dies solis*, (because here speaking to a Heathen Emperor,) yet how it was then solemnly observed, in memory of our Lord Christ's Resurrection, is evident.

'Tis manifest therefore that *the Lords day* (*ἡμέρα κυριακή*, *Dominica*, or *Dies Dominicus*;) was the known name of a day so called when St. John wrote his Revelation; That it was a day of Religious Worship contradistinguished to that of the Jewish Sabbath, so observed and so called by (St. John's Disciple) Ignatius within 8 or 10 years at most after St. John's writing that Book; (Which he

would not have done if he had not thought it to be so meant by his Master St. John.) And in what manner it was observed (in their solemn religious assemblies) *Justin Martyr* tells us within 20 years after that; and that it was otherwise called (*ἡ ἡμέρα*) Sunday. And that *Dominica* or *Dies Dominicus*, hath been so used not onely by the Ancient Christian Writers, *Ignatius, Clemens, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, &c.* but by the *Councils* and *Church History* all along; hath been so often shewed by divers, and is to be seen by any who please to consult them, as is not to be doubted by any; unless we would (under the notion of *Tradition*) deny all History; which in a plain matter of Fact were very unreasonable. Nor can he shew that the name of the *Lords day* ever was (however it might have been as he thinks) attributed to the *Jewish Sabbath*. And therefore to tell us that this name is *stolen* from the *Jewish Sabbath* to be applied to ours, is such a *Fansy* as may be *laughed at*, but doth not deserve a serious Answer. Sure we are that the *Christian Sabbath* hath been long in possession of that name; but, that ever the *Jewish Sabbath* was so, there is no evidence: Therefore the *Theft* must be on his side, who *steals* it from us to give it to the *Jewish Sabbath*.

But he tells us, that our Saviour himself observed the *Jewish Sabbath*. (And I suppose he did so. And, that he was Circumcised also, and did observe the Ceremonial Law.) But it was before his Death and Resurrection. I do not find that he observed it afterward.

But he says, after Christs Death when he had said *It is finished, he kept the Sabbath in the Grave*. Be it so (if that were *keeping a Sabbath*.) And the good Women *rested* on that day according to the Commandment. And why not? Since Christ was not yet risen; nor was the day yet changed, or pretended so to be. This therefore is but *Whimsey* and nothing to the purpose. We all agree; that, till the Resurrection of Christ, the Jews observed the *Jewish Sabbath*, on what they called the Seventh-day of their Week. But whether or no it were a Seventh from the Creation, we cannot tell.

'Tis more to the purpose what he tells us, that *Paul* and other Christians did after Christs Resurrection seem to observe the *Jewish Sabbath*; Going to the *Temple* and to the *Synagogues* on the Sabbath day; meaning thereby the *Jewish Sabbath*. And it is true; They did so go. But I answer;

1. So they did on other days as well as on the Sabbath, and in other places, as well as in the *Synagogue* and the *Temple*, *Act. 5.*

42.

42. *Dayly in the Temple, and in every house. or from house to house* (*καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ κατ' οἶκον*) they ceased not to preach *Jesus Christ*. And *Act. 2. 46.* they continued dayly κατ' οἶκον with one accord in the Temple, καὶ ἐν οἴκοις καὶ κατ' οἶκον ἀκούοντες, and breaking bread at home, or from house to house. As to such duties of Worship as were common to them with the Jews, they took the opportunity of joining therein with them; whether on their Sabbath, or on any other day; but as to what was peculiarly *Christian*, this they performed in separate meetings from them; *breaking Bread at home, κατ' οἶκον, or from house to house*; The Sacrament of the *Lords Supper* (being peculiarly a *Christian service*) they did celebrate in their houses, or separate places of meeting. And so we find it at *Troas*; and, on the first day of the week; *Act. 20. 7. on the first day of the week, when the Disciples were met to break bread Paul preached*. Their meeting for this *Christian service* was in a separate place, and on another day, from that of the *Jewish service*. And *Paul at Athens. Act. 17. 17. he disputeth in the Synagogue with the Jews, and with the devout persons, and in the Market, Dayly, (καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς,)* He took the opportunity of public meetings, whether in the *Synagogues* or elsewhere, whether on the Sabbath or any other day, to preach Christ to them, whether Jews or Greeks. Which doth not prove that they did then take the seventh day to be the *Christian Sabbath*; any more than our going to Hear or Preach a Week-day Lecture, suppose on *Thursday*, would prove, that we take *Thursday* to be our Sabbath: or *Paul's Preaching on Mars-hill, or in the Market-place*, would prove that he took these places to be the *Temple* or *Synagogue*. He knew these to be Times and Places of concourse, and therefore took the opportunity of Preaching Then and There; and would so have done at any other time and place as there was occasion: *In season or out of season, as he adviseth Timothy, 2 Tim. 4. 2.* He doth not deny, p. 122. but that *Paul did keep the Feast* (of the *Pass-over*) after the Resurrection of Christ; Because of what we have *Act. 18. 21. He bids them farewell (at Ephesus) saying, I must by all means keep this Feast that cometh, at Jerusalem; but I will return again unto you, if God will.* Which Feast he thinks to be that of the *Pass-over, though it be not named*. But whether that or whatever Feast of the Jews it be, it is all one as to our business. How great a proof would this have been for the *Seventh-day-Sabbath*, if it had been said *I must by all means keep the Sabbath!* 'Tis said indeed, he did on the Sabbath day go into the *Synagogue* (but so he did on other days,) but not that he kept the Sabbath

G 2

bath

bath day; much less that *he must by all means Keep it.* Or that he must *by all means* take a journey from Ephesus to Jerusalem rather than *not keep it*, though he were *to return thither again.* Yet this Author doth not, for all this think, the Law for the Jewish Pass-over to be then in force. But only that Paul took occasion to be there at that publick great concourse of People, to preach Christ to the multitude. For that the Apostles were under no obligation to keep that feast of the Pass-over, after the death of Christ, is to him (he says) *past doubt.* And why may not we say the same of his going into the Synagogue on the Sabbath day (rather than miss such an opportunity of a publick concourse) which was a less journey than from Ephesus to Jerusalem? though under no obligation to keep the Jewish Sabbath, more than to keep the Jews Pass-over.

2. But I answer further. The Jews who were not Christians, did yet continue to observe the Jewish Sabbath as a matter of duty. And there was no reason why they should not. They did not acknowledge our Christ to be the Messiah, nor the Mosaic Law to be at an end, but Circumcision and the Jewish Economy yet in force, there was no reason why they should not think themselves obliged to the Jewish Sabbath. And many of the Christian Jews, who were not yet satisfied of the Abolition of the Mosaic Law, did comply with them therein. For knowing this to have been a law once, and not yet being fully satisfied that it was expired, they were content still to observe it. (And if our Gentleman be of that mind, I would not hinder him, if a Jew from so doing; but neither would I encourage him.) And if the Apostles willing to connive at it, and even to countenance it. Not as a thing necessary, but at least allowable.

And though they did not think fit to bring a new Token upon the Gentiles, who had not before been obliged to the Jewish Law (and therefore would not allow the Gentiles to be Circumcised as appears by S. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, and the Decree of the Synod at Jerusalem, Act. 15.) yet he allowed the Jews to practise it (to whom it had once been a Law) and according to Circumcised Timothy Act. 16. because, though his Father were Greek, yet his Mother was a Jew: (but he did not Circumcise Titus Gal. 2. 3. for whom there was not the same reason.)

And he did himself comply with the Jewish ceremonies; Act. 18. 18. *Having shorn his head in Cenchrea; For he had a vow.* And those of Purification Act. 21. Not that he thought those Laws now obliging; but, because many of the believing Jews were yet zealous of the Law, and thought themselves obliged by it, would

would not give offense to them. For he was satisfied as to himself, that Circumcision availeth nothing, nor Uncircumcision, 1. Cor. 7. 19. Gal. 6. 15. But was content (till by time and further instruction they should be better satisfied) that each one should be gratified, as to their own practise, according to their own sentiments, as to things yet disputable.

And accordingly, as to eating or not eating things forbidden by Moses's Law, his advice was, to the Romans, (many of whom were Jews) Rom. 14. 17. *Let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth,* (as breaking a Law which he thinks to be yet in force,) *nor let him that eateth, despise him that eateth not,* (as a fool that doth not understand his own liberty) *for the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, &c.*

And in like manner a new Token of Circumcision upon the Gentiles (to whom before it had not been a Law) yet do advise them to forbear things strangled and blood, because this had once been a Law to all the Sons of Noah, Gen. 9. 4.

Not but that even this was now antiquated, but (to avoid offense) because it had once been a Law. For I take even those things to fall under these Generals, *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,* Rom. 14. 17. and every creature of God is good, 1. Tim. 4. 4. *I know, and am persuaded that there is nothing unclean of it self:* But *All things indeed are pure,* Rom. 14. 14, 20. Tit. 1. 15. *Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat, are we the better* (as making use of our lawful liberty) *neither if we eat not* (in compliance with those who be unsatisfied) *are we the worse,* 2 Cor. 8. 8.

So that the Practice of the Apostles or of the Church at that time, in compliance with the Jews, as to what had before been a Law, but now was not; is no argument that the thing was then obligatory, as before it had been, but only an argument of their condescension in things of a middle nature, rather than to give offense to those who were therein unsatisfied; according to that principle of his *All things are lawful for me but all things are not expedient,* 1. Cor. 10. 23. *To give no offense either to Jew or Gentile, or to the Church of God;* ver. 32, 33. *To the Jews I became as a Jew; To the weak I became as weak; I am made all things to all men.* 1. Cor. 9. 19. In so much that even in those things which he knew to be lawful, yet, rather than give offense to a weak brother, he would forbear, *If meat make my brother to offend,* (or, be an offense to a brother) *I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my Brother to offend.* And

And the like I suppose as to the Jewish Sabbath; *He that regardeth a day regardeth it to the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks,* Rom. 14. 6. Where 'tis manifest that he doth parallel the observing or not observing a day then questionable; with the abstaining from meats disputable; that is, from such as before were unlawful, but now ceased so to be, though all were not yet therein satisfied.

And though it be not expressly said, what was the Day thus in question; yet it is most likely to be that of the Jewish Sabbath; For, that the first day of the Week or Christian Sabbath was now not to be observed any more, was the question whether the Jewish Sabbath for continuing Circumcision and the Mosaic Ceremonies, were doubtless for that also. And the Apostles Rule was for a mutual condescension (as to the Jews) for each to follow their own sentiments therein, without censuring one another.

But as to the Gentiles, he seems to be of another mind; And therefore to the Galatians, who were most of them Gentile-Christians, he would not so much as allow the practise of Circumcision (which to the Jews he did;) and tells them that if they be Circumcised Christ profiteth them nothing; and he that is Circumcised is debtor to the whole Law, Gal. 5. 2, 3. For it was a renouncing Christ who had made them Free; putting themselves under the Jewish Yoke, to which (even before) they were not subject.

And therefore to these he speaks more warmly, Gal. 1. 6, 7. *I marvel that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another Gospel: Which is not another, (or, there being no other Gospel than this, where as there is not any other Gospel;) only there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ.* And such are those who would bring on them a new Yoke, (by making that a Duty which God had not made so.) Where he presseth them to keep close to the Gospel of Christ, as by him delivered (without any connexion of Moses's Law,) there being indeed no other Gospel but that; and they who teach them otherwise, do pervert the Gospel; the true Gospel of Christ, including no obligation to the Jewish Law; either as to Circumcision or the difference of meats, or other particulars of that Law; as he argues, in the second, third and fourth Chapters; shewing that even those who were before under it, are now freed from it, and they much more who were never under it. And there-

thereupon Chap. 4. 9, 10, 11. he rebukes them severely, that after they had known God (or rather were known of God) they should turn again to the weak and beggarly rudiments or elements. *Ye observe (saith he) days and months and times and years, I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.*

'Tis not indeed here said in particular, what those days were, that are here meant; yet it is most likely (and scarce to be doubted) to be meant of the Jewish Sabbath. For though other Observation of Times be here reckoned up (there being the same reason of all) yet there was no occasion for the others, in Galatia. For the Jews themselves did not think themselves obliged (nor do the Jews at this day) to the observation of their other Feasts or Fasts out of their own land. But to that of Circumcision, and of the Jewish Sabbath, and the distinction of Meats, they thought themselves obliged even out of their own land. And of such we must understand this to the Galatians. These being the things there in question; not those other, which were confined to the land of Canaan.

But he objects here, that though Days be mentioned, yet not Sabbath-days; and fancies it might be meant of some other days; not of Sabbaths. To gratify him therefore in this also, I will proceed to that of Colos. 2. 16. Where Sabbaths are expressly named.

To the Colossians, who were also Christian Gentiles, he pursues the same notions; *Least any one should beguile them with enticing words,* Col. 2. 4. (thereby to bring them under the Mosaic Law:) He bids them *Beware lest any spoil them through Philosophy and vain deceit.* Whereby, I suppose, he means the Mosaic doctrines or Philosophy of the Jews, (which Clemens Alexandrinus doth all along call φιλοσοφία βαρβάρων in contradistinction to that of the Greeks,) after the traditions of men, after the rudiments (or elements) of the world, and not after Christ, ver. 8. and that particularly of Circumcision ver. 11. (in the room of which, Baptism is come; ver. 12.) Christ, by his Death having blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances (meaning the Jewish Law) and took it out of the way, nailing it to his Cross, ver. 14. and (amongst other things) *Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink* (as if some were now clean others unclean, as under the Mosaic Law,) *or in respect of an holy day, (ἐστὶν ἡ ἑορτή) or of the new Moon, or of the Sabbath days, ἢ νομοῦ ἢ ἑορτῶν,* ver. 16. Where by Sabbath must needs be meant the Jewish Sabbath; the day which in common speech was understood by the word Sabbath.

For

For this, he hath two or three evasions. He doth commonly press hard in other places, that by *Sabbath* is to be understood the Jews *Seventh-day-Sabbath*, and no other. (*The holy Spirit doth call the Seventh-day, the Sabbath, and no other day of the week both in the Old and in the New Testament throughout*, p. 46.) And, I think, he is not much out therein; that it doth, usually, so signify where it doth not come with some intimation to direct us to some other sense. And why it should not be thought so to signify here, I see no reason. For though I take our *Christian Sabbath* to fall as properly under the word *Sabbath* in the Fourth Commandment, as that of the Jews; yet the word, in common use, having by this time become the proper name of that Day which the Jews so called, it was necessary (to avoid confusion) to give the Christian Sabbath another name; as that of the *Lords Day*, or the *first day of the week*. And consequently that the *Sabbaths* here mentioned, are to be understood (according to the then use of the word) of those Sabbaths. Not as if all days of *Holy Rest* were hereby forbidden; but onely the nicety of confining it particularly to that day which was then (in common speech) so called.

But he would not have it here understood of the *Seventh-day Sabbath* (as every where else) but some other *Ceremonial Sabbaths*; but what those are, he doth not tell us.

That there were some other *Feasts* observed by the Jews, which, in the Old Testament, are sometimes called *Sabbaths* (but very seldom,) I do not deny: nor that those come under the general Words in this place. But those do not seem to be here principally intended, because it is manifest to be understood of the Sabbath *there* in dispute. Now there was no occasion of a dispute concerning the observance of those other *Sabbaths*, amongst the Gentiles, out of the *Holy-land*. These observations being not thought obligatory, even to the Jews, but in their own Land onely. And it is expressly provided, *Deut. 16.* that these were not to be kept in any place promiscuously; *not within any of the Gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee; But in the place which the Lord thy God shall chuse to place his name there.* So of the *Pass-over*, ver. 5, 6. So of the *Feast of Pentecost*, ver. 11. So of the *Feast of Tabernacles*, ver. 15. And of altogether, ver. 16. And therefore, not out of their own Land. I do not deny but that they might, in private houses, eat the *Paschal Lamb*, (as Christ did, with his Disciples,) but not *Sacrifice* the *Pass-over*. For it was to be *sacrificed* in the Temple onely; and the *Feast of the Pass-*

*Pass-over* to be there solemnly kept. Not in private houses; and much less out of their own Land.

Nor do I remember, that any where in all the New Testament, the word *Sabbath* is used for any such Sabbaths: Nor can reasonably be supposed to be here meant of those *Feasts*, because it is put in contradistinction to them. *Let no man judge you in respect of a Feast, of the New-Moon, or of the Sabbaths.* Which yet I do not understand as if no Sabbath might now be kept, but that the Obligation to that Sabbath was now at an end.

Another evasion is this, He would have *σαββαται* (*Sabbata*) in the plural number, to signify *Weeks*, not *Sabbath-days*. The *Sabbath-day* being called, in the singular number, *σαββατον* (*Sabbatum*.) For he will rather play at small game than stand out. If we should allow him this, it would not advance his purpose at all. For if the business of *Weeks* be at an end, (that we are no longer to distribute our time into *Weeks*,) than that of the *Sabbath* much more, which he would have to be the seventh day of the *Week*.

But suppose we do allow that one Sabbath is to be called *Sabbatum* what are we to call two or more Sabbaths? Must not they be *Sabbata*? And if this be his meaning, then are we not to observe such *Sabbaths* any longer.

But what must we then say to *Mat. 28.1.* *εἰς τὸ σαββατον*, which we render *In the end of the Sabbath*, meaning thereby the *Seventh day Sabbath* then past, *τὴν ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν σαββατον* as it began to draw towards the first day of the *Week*: must we read it, at the end of the *Sabbaths* (because *σαββαται* is in the plural number,) when the *Sabbaths* (meaning the *seventh-day Sabbaths*) were now at an end, and the *First-day Sabbath* coming on in their place? If that reading please him; it will serve us as well.

But he is mistaken in his Criticism. 'Tis true that *σαββαται* in the plural number seems to be sometime put for a *Week* (but not *Weeks*, that I know of, as he would have it.) And so it is commonly taken to be where we find *εἰς τὸ σαββατον*, for the first day of the *Week* (but may as well be render'd, the first day after the Sabbath.) And so is *σαββατον* in the singular, as *Luk. 18. 12.* *μνηστω δις τὸ σαββατον*, I fast twice in the week, I suppose he would not have us render it I fast twice on the Sabbath-day (though it be in the singular number,) as if he did fast twice upon one day. But thus rather, I keep two Fasts to one Sabbath, which is the same in sense with, I fast twice in the *Week*. In like manner as the *Olympiad*, may be taken sometime for that particular year on which were the *Olympick Games* (which were wont to return

every fifth year inclusively, that is, as we use to speak the fourth year after the last Olympick; sometime for the interval of four years from the end of one Olympick to the end of the next following. So here, *Sabbatum* may be sometime taken strictly for the Sabbath-day; and sometime for the whole septiduum or week from Sabbath to Sabbath.

And so is *Sabbata* (in the plural number) taken also for a Sabbath-day; Thus I take it to be here, (*Mat. 28. 1.*) ὁπότε οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα ὁπότε οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα when the Sabbath-day was ended; in the same sense with that of *Mark 16. 1.* ὁπότε οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα (speaking of the very same time) when the Sabbath was past. And in like manner, *Matth. 12. 1.* At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the Corn, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα (*Sabbatis*) in the plural number. And so it is in *Mark 2. 23.* ἐν τῇ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα. Yet it is meant but of one day, as appears by the parallel place (where the same is again related) *Luk. 6. 1.* ἐν τῇ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα. And so *Mat. 12. 5, 10, 12.* *Mar. 3. 4.* *Luk. 4. 31.* *Luk. 6. 2, 9.* And οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα in the Septuagint is commonly put for the Sabbath-day. I will not say *always* (because I have not examined it) but in all the places which I consulted. And even in the body of the Ten Commandments *Exod. 20. 8.* μνησθε τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα. (*Remember the day of the Sabbaths;* in the plural number.) And again ver. 10. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα τῇ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα (but the seventh day Sabbaths to the Lord thy God;) So *Ex. 16. 13.* οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα ἀνάπαυς ἀπὸ τῆς οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρας. (*the Sabbaths a holy Rest unto the Lord, to-morrow.*) And *Levit. 23. 3.* six days shall work be done, but the seventh is οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα the Sabbaths of Rest; ye shall do no work therein, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα τῇ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα it is the Sabbaths of the Lord. Which are the signal places wherein the Sabbath is commanded. And the like very often (if not always) in the Septuagint, whose language the New Testament doth usually follow. So that his Criticism comes to nothing, but only to shew how careless he is of what he says if at least he may seem to say somewhat. (Such is that when he tells us p. 136. that God who hath reserved a Tenth of our Substance, hath reserved But a Seventh of Time. As though he thought a tenth part to be more than a seventh part. And many such negligences, which I spare to mention.)

But whether we render it *sabbath-day* or *sabbath-days* the sense is still the same. And the Apostles design in all these places seems to be this, that though to the Jews, to whom it had once been a Law, he doth allow a liberty (till they should be better satisfied) for each to follow his own judgment (without censuring others) as well in this of the Jewish Sabbath, as in the business of Circumcision, and the abstinence from Meats, and their other Rites;

yet

yet he would by no means suffer these to be brought upon the Gentiles as a new Yoke to which before they had not been subject.

I say as a new Yoke to which they had not been subject. For though I do admit that by natural light, or the Law of Nature, man ought to allow a competent time for the solemn service of God; and, by a positive Law, that it should be at least one day in seven, that is, after six days of Labour, the seventh to be a day of Rest; and so much to be intended in the Fourth Commandment: Yet, I do not think it to be so determined to this day in order, as to be unchangeable to after Ages.

We can be no ways sure, that the seventh day in order from the first raining of Manna, *Ex. 16.* was the seventh in order from the Creation. And as they did observe it then in order from thence; so when Christ, or his Apostles by direction from him, did put it into a new order, this new order doth as well sute the words of the Fourth Commandment as that former.

I do the rather say that this to the Gentiles is a new Yoke, because I find this to be given as a sign, a covenant, or distinctive mark given to the Jews, as Gods peculiar People, in contradistinction to other Nations; just as Circumcision was. So *Exod. 31. 13.* My Sabbaths ye shall keep, for it is a Sign between me and you throughout your generations, and ver. 16. The Children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual Covenant, and ver. 17. It is a Sign between me and the Children of Israel for ever. So *Ezek. 20. 12.* I gave them my Sabbaths to be a Sign between me and them; and ver. 20. They shall be a Sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God. Just as it is said of Circumcision, *Gen. 17. 7.* I will establish my Covenant between me and thee (saith God to Abraham) and thy seed after thee, for an Everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee: and ver. 10, 11. This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee, every male-child among you shall be Circumcised, and it shall be a Token of the Covenant between me and you: and ver. 13. My Covenant shall be in your flesh an everlasting Covenant, (not as if Circumcision were to be for ever obligatory; but *rebus sic stantibus*, so long as things continued in that estate.) And so it is called *Rom. 4. 11.* He received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith. And such was the Blood of the Paschal Lamb on the Doorposts of the house, *Ex. 12. 7.* to be a distinctive mark between the Israelites and the Egyptians; as ver. 13. The blood shall be to you for a Token upon the houses where you are, and when I see the blood

H 2

I will

*I will pass over you.* And so *Ex. 11. 5, 6, 7.* *That ye may know how that the Lord doth put a Distinction between the Egyptians and Israel.*

And our Author himself, *pag. 26.* doth prels the same, and puts great weight upon it, that *this Seventh-day sabbath is often called a Sign for ever between him and them, and a perpetual Covenant, to Distinguish his People from others;* that is, the people of the Jews from other Nations. And so to be a *Sign for Ever*, as Circumcision is an *Everlasting Covenant*.

Now whatsoever was a *Distinctive Mark* of the People of *Israel*, from other Nations, as was that of *Circumcision*, the *Pass-over*, and the *Seventh-day-sabbath*, was at an end and to cease when the *Partition-wall was broken down* between Jew and Gentile, when Christ had made both one, and abolished in his  *flesh the Enmity* (even the law of Commandments contained in Ordinances, to make of *Irreconcilable* One new man; to reconcile both in One body by the Cross, having slain the Enmity thereby, *Eph. 2. 14, 15, 16.* Or as it is *Col. 2. 14.* *Having blotted out the hand-writing of Ordinances which was against us, and was contrary to us,* (as separating us Gentiles from the Jews, and so excluding us out of Gods Visible Church,) and *nailing it to his Cross.* From whence he there infers, *ver. 16.* *Let no man Therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of a holy-day* (a Festival) *or of Sabbaths,* (the proper name, at that time, of the *seventh-day Sabbath*;) *which things are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ;* these being but shadows or empty things, whereas it is the *body*, (the Substance) that Christ regards *αὐτὴν τὴν οὐσίαν, τὸ ὅτι οὐσία τὸ θεοῦ,* those are but shadows, but 'tis the *Body* that Christ looks at. That is, (in our language) those are only *Circumstantial*s, but 'tis *Substance* or the *Substantial*s of Religion that Christ and Christianity respects. And, as it is merely *Circumstantial* (and doth not at all influence Religion) whether in the *Temple* or other place God be worshiped (*Joh. 4. 21.*) So, whether on *this* or *another* day, a Sabbath be kept.

If therefore those Sabbaths (as is shewed) were distinctive Marks or Signs of Gods peculiar Covenant or Contract with the Church of *Israel* as their peculiar God, in contradistinction to other Nations; then 'tis manifest that those other Nations did not at all keep a *sabbath*, or not on *this Day*; (else how could this be a distinctive Mark?) and therefore to bring this now upon the Gentile, was to bring upon them a *new Yoke*.

I add further, that this *Jewish Sabbath* (as is shewed before) seems to be, not a Continuation of a former Sabbath from the Creation, (which I doubt was either not observed at all, or had long

long before this time been forgot,) but rather a New Institution or Restitution after their coming out of *Egypt* (from a new *Epocha*) at *Marah*; where God is said to have made a *Statute* and an *Ordinance*, *Exod. 15. 25.* to which Commandment and Statute if they would hearken diligently and give ear, he would not bring upon them the Diseases which he had brought upon *Egypt*, For (saith he) *I am the Lord that healeth thee*, *ver. 26.* Whereupon follows (in the next Chapter) a *sabbath* to be observed on the *seventh-day* from the first raining of *Manna*, (not from the first Creation.) And with reference to their *Rest* or *Refreshing* after their *Labour* or *Bondage* in *Egypt* (the first-born of the *Egyptians* were slain.) For so he saith, *Exod. 31. 13.* *My Sabbath shall ye keep, for it is a Sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you* (or separate you to my self as a peculiar people, a holy people;) and *ver. 16, 17.* *The Children of Israel shall keep my Sabbaths* (αὐτὰν) *for a perpetual Covenant; It is a Sign between Me and the Children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, and on the Seventh Day he Rested and was Refreshed.* Not that God was *Wearied* with his *Work*, and needed *Refreshment*; but he doth parallel his *Rest* after his *Work* of Creation, with their *Refreshment* after their *Labour* in *Egypt*.

And that God had a particular respect to their *Rest* and *Refreshment* from their *Labour* and *Bondage* in *Egypt*; is farther evident, not onely from the General Preface to all the Commandments, (*I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt; out of the house of Bondage;*) but from the Close of this *Fourth* Commandment, as it is repeated in *Deut. 5. 12, 13, 14, 15.* (some-what different from what is in *Exod. 20.*) where, (instead of *For in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, &c.* *Exod. 20. 11.*) we have (*Deut. 5. 15.*) *And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day.* Which shews that this Sabbath, had a particular respect to that deliverance.

Now as God by *Moses* did, upon a New occasion (of their Rest from their *Labour* in *Egypt*) give a New *Epocha* or Beginning to a Circulation of Sabbaths, to be reckoned from thence, in imitation of his own Resting from the Work of Creation; Not by the *Fourth* Commandment (for that speaks indifferently as to any Circulation,) but by this *Ordinance* at *Marah*, or at *Elim* (for 'tis this de-

determines the Circulation to the *seventh* day after the raining of *Manna*; ) So might Christ as well (by himself or his Apostles) fix another *Epocha* from his *Resurrection*; (as we have reason to think he did;) and this Equally within the prospect of the Fourth Commandment. This *Rest* from the *Egyptian Bondage*, being as much a *shadow*, of what Christ regards as the *substance*; as was the escaping of the *Egyptian Destruction*, of which the *Pass-over* was the Memorial. And accordingly this *Circulation* equally to cease with that of the *Pass-over*, at the coming of Christ; not *New* Circulation from another of the *Fourth Commandment*, in a *pressy* said that Christ *Bid* his *Apostles* so to do: But as *indeed* presumed to do what he did by *Gods* direction; so the *Apostles* by *Christs* direction; to whom he gave *Commandments* for that purpose, *Act. 1. 2, 3.*

As to what he says so often; that not one *Jott* or *Tittle* of the *Law* (meaning that of the *Decalogue*) is *destroyed*, but doth still continue in force: This, as to the *substance of the Duty*, I grant. But if his meaning be, that there is not a *Word* or *Letter* therein which doth not as *literally* belong to *Us* Now, as it did Then to *Israel*: I cannot assent to it. For it cannot be said of all *Us* who are under that *Law*, that God hath *Brought us out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of Bondage*; or that *We* are to expect *long life, in the land* (of *Canaan*) *which he Gave Them*.

If he say that our deliverance from *spiritual bondage* is equivalent to theirs from *Egypt*, and our *land* the same to us as *Canaan* was to them: I grant it. But so is our *Lords Day* equivalent to their *Seventh-day-sabbath*, and Christ the *true Manna* (more than) equivalent to that of theirs, from the raining of which they reckoned their *Jewish Sabbaths*.

As to what he says of *Mat. 24. 20. Pray that your flight be not in the Winter, nor on the Sabbath-day*; which he thinks to be understood of the *Jewish Sabbath*, 38 years after Christs *Resurrection*. Perhaps it may. For the obstinate Jews, (who would not in their day understand the things that belonged to their peace, but rejected Christ,) did no doubt continue to observe their *Jewish Sabbath*, and thought themselves obliged so to do: And it would then be as great an *Affliction* to them, as if their *Sabbath* were yet in force: But no more a *sin* to fly on that day, than to fly in the *Winter*. It would be so to the *Christians*, if put to flight on the *Christian Sabbath* (for the case would be the like of both) and they might as well *Pray against it*: That is, *Against their Flight*

on

on the *Christian Sabbath*; as the *Jews* on the *Jewish Sabbath*. This therefore makes nothing at all to his purpose. He might as well argue from hence, that it were a *sin* to labour in *Winter*; as, on the *Jewish Sabbath*.

He hath many other little excursions, as little to the purpose, with which I shall not trouble my self or you; having fully answered what seems to me to have any appearance of Argument.

But he takes great pleasure to expose the Name of *Sunday*. Yet I do not find any more fond of using it, than he. Not, that he would be thought to *like* the Word, but because he thinks it a *Reproach*. If he do not like that name, he may call it as we do, the *Lords Day*, the *Christian Sabbath*, or (if he think these too good names for it) he may call it the *First day of the Week*.

But why not as angry with the *Monday*? or other of the *Week* days? If on *Monday* the Heathens (as he would have us think) did worship the *Moon*, as the *Sun* on *Sunday*, why is he not as angry with that? It is as much Idolatry to worship the *Moon* on *Monday*, as the *Sun* on *Sunday*. True. But that doth not concern the *Christians Sabbath* (which is what he hath I mind to reproach) and therefore he speaks little of the other, and but seldom: But *Sunday* is to be snubbed upon every occasion.

He would not have a *Sabbath* upon *Sunday*, because he says, on that day they worshiped the *Sun*. But why upon *Saturday* if on that day (as he would have us think) they worshiped *Saturn*?

Now 'tis true that some of the Heathen did worship the *Sun*, and the *Moon*, and the *Host of Heaven*. But that they did worship the *Sun* more upon *Sunday*, than they did upon *Monday* or *Tuesday*, is more than I know, or he can prove. He tells us, *Verstegan* says, that the *Heathen Saxons* did so. But *Verstegan* is too young an Author to settle this upon his own Authority; unless he can bring Vouchers for it more ancient than himself. It was, I suppose, a *Fansy* of *Verstegan* Then (as it is of our Author Now;) But I do not remember that he cites any Author ancients than himself. And though some others may say the like; Yet I look upon it but as a *plausible conjecture*, without any good foundation in History. And even the *Heathen Saxons* are too late for his purpose.

He tells us, p. 88. *The Heathen Nations long before Christs Birth did offer Sacrifice to the Sun, and worship it as a God upon Sunday*. His proof is from *Job 31. 26, 27, 28. If I beheld the Sun when it shined, or the Moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand, this were an iniquity to be punished by the Judges, for I should have denied the Lord above.*

But

But what is all this to Sunday? It may perhaps be a disclaimer of *worshipping the Sun*; but says nothing of *Sunday*.

Doth our Author think the name of *Sunday* to be as old as *Job's* time? If *Job* had said, *If I have worshipped the Sun upon Sunday, or the Moon upon Monday, and not the Lord upon Saturday*; it had been to his purpose: But here is nothing of that. Not a word of *what day* it was on which they worshipped the Sun.

But I would not have him lay too great a load upon *Sunday*. For *Hesiod* tells us (as was said before) that in his time (one of the oldest of the Heathen Writers; though younger than *Job*) the *Seventh* day was *Sun-day*, not the *First*. And he hath nothing to shew (more than the bare Name of *Sunday*) to make us believe that those of the Heathen, who worshipped the Sun, did confine that worship to *this* day of the Week; or, Did more worship it on this day than on others.

I do not certainly know how Ancient those Names are of *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, &c. nor upon what occasion they were first taken up, (nor is it much to our purpose.)

The most ancient Heathen Writer whom I know to have mentioned them is *Dio Cassius*, who lived about the Year of our Lord 230. Who speaking of the Destruction of *Jerusalem* and the *Temple*, tells us that the *Jews* had such a reverence for *Saturn's-day*, as that they would not *Labour* on that day for their Defence; which the *Romans* understanding, did on that day assault them; and prevailed. (Against their *Temple* and *Sabbath* both at once.) Not as if the *Jews* did then call it *Saturn's-day*, (nor am I sure that any other did then so call it,) for they called it their *Sabbath-day*; But it was that day of the Week which, in *Dio's* time, was called *Saturday*.

But *Dio* speaks of it as a *new Thing* so to call the Days of the Week, and which the *Ancient Greeks* (he tells us) knew not. ('Twas therefore not very Ancient.) And therefore he supposeth the *Romans* to have taken it up from the *Egyptians*. Not the Old *Egyptians* of *Moses's* time, but rather from those about the time of *Ptolemy*; not of King *Ptolemy*, but of *Claudius Ptolemaeus* the Astronomer (or perhaps somewhat earlier) when Astronomy there flourished, and from whom the *Romans* had it.

In a Christian Writer, I find it earlier than *Dio*; in *Justin Martyr's* Apology, written about the Year of Christ 150. who mentions τὸ ἡμεῖς ἡμέραν, the *Day of the Sun*, as the Christian Sabbath. And *Tertullian* in his *Apology*, mentions *Saturday* and *Sunday*. And it may perhaps be found in Writers earlier than these, Though I do not at present meet with it. Nor do I think it worth

worth the while to make any great search about it. I grant, that when Christianity was spread among the Gentiles; and, with it, the Christian Sabbath; they did (in order to the observing that Sabbath) distinguish their time into *Weeks*; and thereupon gave Names to each Day. I grant also that the *Jews* did, before, so distinguish their Time: but I do not find that any other Nation did so. If any think, that All nations did so distinguish, and every Nation, all the World over, call the days by those Names by which they are now called: This I take to be but a *Presumption*, without proof.

But whenever those names were first taken up, I do not think they were taken from the *number of their Gods* (for then they must have had a great many more days in their Week than Seven, if each of their Gods must have a peculiar day: ) But from the number of the *Planets*, which were then reckoned to be *seven*, and in this order *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Sol*, *Venus*, *Mercury*, *Luna*. Though we now know the Planets to be more than Seven. (For the *Satellites* of *Jupiter* and *Saturn* are as much *Planets* as our *Moon*; but were not then known.) Nor were the Seven Planets always reckoned in the same order; but some had been thought to be *above* the Sun, which, before these names were given, were accounted to be *below* it. And therefore these Names must be at least so late. And certainly not so old as *Job's* time.

I take them not to be older than what are called the *Planetary Hours*, but to take their Rise from thence; and the Order of the Names to be thence determined. For having divided the Day into 24 Hours; Beginning with *Saturn*, the highest of the Planets, they assigned to him the *First* hour of one day, which thence they called *Saturn's-day*; the Second hour to *Jupiter*; the Third to *Mars*, and so in order till they came to the Eighth hour which falls to *Saturn's* turn again, and so again to the Fifteenth, and the Two and Twentieth; and then the Three and Twentieth to *Jupiter*, the Four and Twentieth to *Mars*, and the next hour, being the first of the next day, to *Sol*. Which day doth thence take the name of *Sol* or *Sunday* (next in order after *Saturn*.) And, in like manner proceeding, the Eighth, Fifteenth, and Two and Twentieth hour of that day will fall again to *Sol*, the Three and Twentieth to *Venus*, the Four and Twentieth to *Mercury*; and then the first hour of the next day to *Luna*, thence called *Monday* (next after *Sunday*.) And, in like manner, the first hour of the following day to *Mars*; of the next to *Mercury*; the next to *Jupiter*; the next to *Venus*; and then again to *Saturn*; and so onward as before. And this I

take to be the true account of those Names, and in that Order: *Saturday, Sunday, Monday*, after which (in the Latine Denomination) follow the days of *Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, and Venus*.

But some of our Ancestors the Saxons, thought fit (as is supposed) to put in the Names of *Twisco, Woden, Thor, Frea*, (some of their Princes) instead of *Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, and Venus*, (as *Julius* and *Augustus*, amongst the *Romans*, gave their Names to the Months formerly called *Quintilis* and *Sextilis*.) From which Saxon Princes we have the Names of *Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday* and *Fryday*: the other days retaining the Names of their respective Planets as they did before.

This account (from the order of the Planetary Hours) *Dio* gives us of the Names of the Week-days, and of their Order. Why so called, and why in this Order.

He tells us of another account from the Principles of *Harmonicks*. Because *Dia-tessaron* (which we call a *Fourth*) is Reputed a *Concord* in Musick; therefore they might, beginning with *Saturn* (skipping two, *Jupiter* and *Mars*;) take the Fourth *Sol*: then (skipping the two next *Venus* and *Mercury*) take *Luna*: and then (skipping *Saturn* and *Jupiter*) take *Mars*: Then (skipping *Sol* and *Venus*) take *Mercury*: Then (skipping *Luna* and *Saturn*) take *Jupiter*: Then (skipping *Mars* and *Sol*) take *Venus*: Then (skipping *Mercury* and *Luna*) take *Saturn*; and so onward as before. But this account seems more *Forced*, and the former more *Natural*. Which therefore I take to be the true ground of this Order.

But either way, depending upon the order of the Planets as they were then accounted when these Names were given to the Week-days, it is at least so far evident that they cannot be older than since the Planets were accounted to be placed in this order. And therefore not so old as when *Venus* or *Mercury* or both of them were thought to be above the *Sun*. (For this would quite disturb the Order.) And therefore, certainly, not so old as *Job's* time.

Whether on each of these *Days* they did worship those respective *Planets*, as so many *Gods*, I cannot say; nor do I think it.

Nor do I think that each of those *Planets* have any more *Government* of their respective *Hours*, or *Days*, than of others. For I take the whole foundation as well of *These*, as of the other parts of *Judicial Astrology*, to be purely *Precarious*; and assigned onely at pleasure, by those whose business it was to amuse credulous people, and thereby to make a Gain of them.

But,

But, whatever were the occasion of the first imposing; these are now the known Names of those days. (And we need no more scruple the use of these *Names*; than to talk of Pope *Pius, Clemens, Boniface*, and *Innocent*; though possibly the Persons so called, had none of those good *Qualities*.) In like manner as we have a Spring near *Oxford* which we call *Aristotle's Well*; not that we think *Aristotle* was ever there, or was *Lord* of the place, and much less that he was wont to be *there Worshiped*; but we so call it as being now the *proper name* of the place (imposed at pleasure) by which it is known. And so for the days of the *Week*; whatever were the occasion of the first imposing, they now signify no more than the proper distinctive names by which the days are known.

And why we may not continue so to call them, I know not. We are told *Act. 17. 19, 22.* of *Paul's* being at *Arcopagus* or *Mars-hill*, because that was the known name of the place, without scrupling the reason why it was so called (whether, because *Mars* had been there worshiped, or for what other reason.) And *Act. 28. 11.* of a *Ship* designed by *Castor* and *Pollux*, or *Stowager*, without scrupling the reason of that name, or what relation these Stars had to *Jupiter*, so as to be called *his Lads*. And when *Paul 1 Cor. 8.* allows them without Scruple to eat of things offered in Sacrifice to *Idols*, even though they knew, or had reason to presume them so to be, (unless when they might be suspected to do it with respect to the *Idol*) as the Apostle argues at large *1 Cor. 8.* and again *Chap. 10.* No doubt we may as lawfully make use of proper Names (whereby persons, times, or places be commonly known) without scrupling the occasion of their first imposition.

And I would desire those Gentlemen (who are so over scrupulous where there is no just occasion, and make it their business to throw Scruples and cast Stumbling-blocks before others,) to consider seriously, whose Work they be doing all that while; and whether it be not as truly and properly *superstition* to represent and quarrel with things as unlawful and sinful, which in their own nature are not so; as it is to introduce things under a pretence of *holiness* which have in them no such thing. And whether this be not to dote about questions and Strife of words: Whether these be not of those foolish and unlearned questions which we are advised to avoid; knowing that they gender strifes; and to avoid foolish questions, and genealogies and contentions about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain; and instead thereof to mind those things that are good and profitable to men; to follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, &c. as we are directed, *1 Tim. 6. 4, 5. 2 Tim. 2. 22, 23. Tit. 3. 8, 9.*

I 2

They

They do not consider how much the studying and prosecuting these *foolish questions*, and needless *Scrupulosities*, doth eat out the *power of Godliness* and true *Piety*, and the *Substantials* of Religion, while we busy our selves about these *shadows*; about little *circumstances* which do not at all influence the Substance of *spiritual* Worship.

There be so many *necessary duties*, and *indubitable truths*, in the serious practice of *Piety and Godliness*, that we need not trouble the heads of men (and make it our business so to do) with *doubtful disputations*.

It seems to be the design of the New Testament to take us off from the *Circumstantials* and *Scrupulosities* of Religion (which commonly produce *strifes* and contentions to no purpose) and put us upon *worshipping God in Spirit and in Truth*.

*Si Deus est Animus, nobis ut carmina dicunt,  
Hic tibi precipue sit pura Mente colendus,*

Was well enough said of the Poet; and is a good Paraphrase on that, *God is a Spirit and will be worshiped in Spirit and in Truth*. I have been told long since of a Grave Divine, who when asked, Why he did not Preach against *Long hair* (which was at that time more Offensive than now it is,) gave this Answer; if he could but Preach Jesus Christ into their *Hearts*; he should not much concern himself for their *Hair*.

This Author tells us, p. 49, that our *Liberty* Gal. 5. 1. doth eminently consist in a *Freedome* not onely from the *Ceremonial Law* of old, but also in a *Liberty* not to be intangled with a new yoke of *mens devices*. I take *needless Scrupulosities* to be such; the making of more Sins than God hath made; the making or pretending of those things to be Sins which are no sins, and putting a *religious Necessity* upon things which are matters of meer *Prudence* and *Discretion*. Like those 1 Tim. 4. 3. *Forbidding to Marry*, or (as I would rather render it) *Bidding not to Marry*; and, to abstain from *Meats*, &c. *Forbidding* things as *Unlawful* which are not so; is alike *Superstitious* as to *Impose* things as *holy* which are not *Holy*; and equally contrary to the *Liberty* there intended.

Whether the days be called *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, or *Alpha*, *Beta*, *Gamma*, is all one to me, (I take them as I find them;) I think we ought not to foment quarrels upon such trifles; and we sin if we do so.

Whether to meet once, or twice, or thrice, on a Sabbath-day, (if so as is most for edification and the real service of God,) is meerly *pru-*

*prudential* in this or that place, without laying a new religious yoke where God leaves it to *Prudence*. And if, in *Prudentials*, things be not managed sometimes with so much *Prudence* as we think they might, we must be content to bear with such *Imprudences* as we cannot help; and better so, than to pull-on greater *Inconveniences*.

Whether to begin the Sabbath at Six or Ten or Twelve a Clock on Saturday-night, is a thing (I think) not worth contending about, (so that it be religiously observed as to the *Substantials* of it,) and for which we ought not to disturb the Church where we live, but to follow *righteousness, charity, peace*; and avoid *foolish questions which gender strife*. I think it much more, whether on this or that day, so the Sabbath be well kept: and I would by no means, on that account, give a disturbance to a Church where it is peaceably settled: 'Tis less material *When*, than *How*, a Sabbath be kept. And, in many cases, it must be unavoidably left to *Prudence*, whether this or that day be called the *First* or *Seventh* day of the Week. We are in such cases to study the things that make for *Peace*, and *wherewith one may Edify another*. Rom. 14. 19. The fruits of the *spirit* are *love, joy, peace*, &c. but *variance, emulation, wrath, strife*, are *fruits of the flesh*: Gal. 5. 20, 21.

To study and spin out *Disputes* into too fine a Thread (like that of a Spider out of her own Bowels) is but to pervert the *Simplicity* of the Gospel of Christ; to make that *Abstruse* and *Difficult*, which the Scripture would have *Plain* and *Easy*: in *Speculatives*, as well as *Practicals*. We should mind the *substantials* of *spiritual* worship; and not dote upon *circumstantials* further than as they do really advance the Substance. *Refuse profane and old-wives fables, and exercise thyself rather unto Godliness*; for *bodily exercise profiteth little*, 1 Tim. 4. 7, 8. Such are those Col. 2. 20, 21. *Touch not, taste not, handle not*, (and others of like nature) all which perish in the using, (there is no real advantage doth accrue from the use of them; 'tis but labour lost;) or 2 Cor. 6. 8. *we are but mischievous in their use*.

We complain of the Papists (and deservedly) for loading their Worship with a multitude of *Ceremonies* and mimical *Gestures*; the number of which would be a *Burthen*, even though singly they were *Tolerable*. Being so many *Diversions* of the mind from Attending the *spirituality* of the Service. But they have some reason for it. For when much of their Devotion is either to be spoken so low as not to be *Heard*, or in such a *Language* as not to be understood,

stood, they have need of somewhat to gratify the *Eye*, when the *Ear* is not *Edified*.

And it is almost the same mischief, when mens Minds are amused with nice Speculations and needless Scrupulosities, whereby they are diverted from the Substantials of serious Religion.

Yet I would not so be understood, as if no care were to be had of *Corporeal* Worship, or the necessary Circumstances attending it. (For God expects the Worship of the Body as well as the Soul, and *Religious* Actions must have their *Circumstances*, as Time, Place, Gesture, and the like, as well as other *Actions*.) But these *Circumstances* of the Worship;) and as *Prudent* (not as the *Substance* of all other actions) as may, with Decency and Convenience, be in advance the *spiritual* Worship; and may be varied according as the diversity of times and places may require. Not to lay the weight of *Divine Institution* upon such little things. As if, because *Paul* *Kneeled down and Prayed* (*Act. 20. 36.*) therefore it were unlawful to use any other *Gesture* in Praying; Or as if, because *Christ* bids, *when thou Prayest, enter into thy Closet and shut the door.* (*Mat. 6. 6.*) therefore we may not Pray in the Chamber, Parlour, Dining-Room, or Chappel: Or, because *Christ* did Celebrate the Lords Supper, at *Night*, in an *Upper-room*, to *Men* onely, and but *Twelve*, and to those *sitting or lying*; therefore we may not do it at *Noon* or *Morning*, in a *Low-room*, to *Women* as well as *Men*, in greater *Numbers*, or in some other *Gesture*. For though such *Circumstances* may be *Lawful*, and sometime *Advisable* when convenient; yet to put a *Religious Necessity* upon them, as of *Divine Institution*, looks like a piece of *Superstition*.

And if we consider seriously how great a mischief many times some needless Scruples do create to the Church of God; how great a matter a little fire kindles; and how great hindrance to real Piety; it might justly make us wary how we add Fuel to such a Flame, and rather bear with some things we think amiss, (but may perhaps not be so) than by attempting to remove a suppos'd Evil create a greater Mischief.

As to the present point in question; I have said so much upon the whole, as I think might satisfy the Gentleman if he well consider it. Yet I know, when men have once espoused a notion of which they are fond; and have so long pored upon it as to rivet it in their mind; catching at every little thing that may seem to favour it, and slighting whatever makes against it; (as we find our Author doth very often;) And that hardly any thing

thing can be said so plain, as that there be nothing to be cavilled at, by one who is minded so to do; And that when God hath declared his Will as plainly as he thinks fit to do, if men will not be contented with reasonable evidence, he is not obliged to gratify their humours.

When (I say) we consider this; It looks somewhat like what *Solomon* tells us *Prov. 18. 19.* of a *Brother offended*, harder to be won than a *strong City*; and I must leave the success to God, who so teacheth as none like him.

He remits us to two Writers on this Subject, in defense of the Christian Sabbath, Mr. *Shepherd* and Mr. *Hughes* (whom I have not read, nor have them at hand,) and Two others whom he names not (nor know I well whom he means, for more than two have since written;) who, he thinks, do tacitly retract somewhat that those before had granted. And divers others have written on this Subject, tho' I have scarce consulted any of them. And particularly I have not seen what is written by Dr. *Young* or Mr. *Warren*, whom I find cited in a late Book of *G. T.* which came out since this was Written and part of it Printed. It is very possible, that some of those may have said much of what I now say, or that I may now say somewhat of what they have said before. But, in this, there is no hurt. If in some particulars I vary from some of them, it is not because I slight them, or out of a desire to contradict them, but freely to speak my own thoughts as they do theirs. Nor is it to be expected that all Writers on the same Subject should agree in every particular, (Nor is he to make advantage of it; For p. 3. he owns it is so also with those who are for the seventh-day:) But as to the main (I presume) we do well enough agree.

I have been a great deal longer than I did intend when I first began to write.

I shall give you a brief Summe of what I have said to this purpose, as to both Questions. (For the Question is double, though it seem to be but one.)

First concerning the *Jewish Sabbath*, Whether that be Antiquated and at an end. Secondly, concerning the *Christian Sabbath*, Whether there be sufficient ground for this to succeed in the place thereof.

As to the first; I agree with him in many things which he prosecutes at large, though not peculiar to his Question; As, That Our Lord *Jesus Christ* is God; that he is the Lord *Jehovah*, the God who made the World, who rested the seventh day, who brought

brought Israel out of Egypt, and gave the Law on Mount Sinai: For there is no other God.

But, this I say, he did as God (in Union with the Father and Holy Ghost;) not as Christ (God and Man) our Mediator and Redeemer. For he was not *then* Man; nor was there occasion of a Mediator and Redeemer before the Fall.

I agree also that the Decalogue (or Ten Commandments) is Obligatory to us Gentiles; (as being for the substance of it, a Law before it was so delivered on Mount Sinai.) And that the Fourth Commandment concerning the Sabbath is one of them; which requires after *six days* of Labour, the *seventh day* to be a Sabbath or day of Holy Rest. And our Christian Sabbath is such.

But it doth not say, *the seventh in course from the Creation*, nor doth it appear that the Jewish Sabbath was such, but rather the Seventh day from the *first raining of Manna*.

I do agree also that God himself did rest on the Seventh day from the Creation, Gen. 2. that is, he did *cease to Create*.

But I do not there find, that Man did so rest, or that there was any *express command* for him so to do on that day; much less for ever after, on every Seventh day in course from the Creation. How much may be thought to be *implied* in those words, he *blessed and sanctified it*, I will not dispute; However, it is but by *Implication* not by any *express command*; such as our Author demands for the Christian Sabbath.

Nor do I find that ever it was observed by Man till after the Israelites coming out of Egypt, or *expressly commanded* so to be.

Nor do I find that any other Nation (beside the Jews) did anciently so much as divide their time by *Weeks*. Since the times of Christianity they have: But that they did so, long before that time, I do not find.

X I do agree also that after Israel's coming out of Egypt they did observe a Sabbath, Exod. 16.

But it was from a *new command*, (at Marah or Elim) which appeared *New* to them, not a continuation of a constant practise; and it was from a *new beginning* (the Seventh day from the first raining of Manna,) and as a *distinctive sign* or *token*, of Gods being their God in a special manner, as contradistinguished to other nations; (as himself owns p. 26. and 28.) and as a memorial of their *Refreshing* after their *Bondage* and *Labour* in Egypt, and feeding them with *Bread from Heaven*.

I do presume also that, they did, from this first raining of Manna continue a circulation of *Weeks* for a long time, and perhaps till the time of our Saviour. Yet

Yet we are not sure but that it might be intermitted in the *seventy years* of the *Babylonish Captivity*, and the day forgotten; and then restored a-new by *Nehemiah* (from a new beginning) *Neb. 13.* as he restored the *Feast of Tabernacles* (Chap. 8.) which had been intermitted *from the days of Joshua the son of Nun to that day*. But I rather think, the memory was preserved (by Tradition) during those *seventy years*.

I agree also that the Church of the Jews was the *most visible Church* of God, but I am loth to say (with him, p. 79.) it was the *whole visible Church*; For I presume there might be many *Good men* of other Nations, who worshiped the *true God* (of whom we have no History,) though not joined to the Jewish Church, nor were (that I know of) obliged so to be. Such was *Melchizedek* (whoever he were) not of the seed of *Abraham*, much less of *Israel*. And such was *Job*, and his *Friends* from divers Countries (of whom, were it not for the story of *Job*, we should have had no knowledge,) nor are we to think these were the *only persons* of those Countries who worshiped the true God. And how many such were in other Nations, we cannot tell. Who might, if they had opportunity, join as *Proselytes* with the Jewish Church, when established. But I do not think they were *necessarily obliged* so to do, or to keep the *same Sabbath* with them.

For I take it to be true, even before Christ's coming, that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. Act. 10. 34, 35. Whether Jew or Greek, Rom. 2. 10, 11. 1 Pet. 1. 17. Which are but Quotations from Deut. 10. 19.

Nor do I find that any Nation, except the Jews, did observe the Jewish Sabbath. But I rather take it to be a *distinctive sign* of them from other Nations, Ex. 31. 13, 17. as *Circumcision* and the *Pass-over* were; which, when the wall of partition was taken away, ceased also.

Yet, as to what was Moral in them (the *Circumcision of the heart*; being pointed at by that of the *Flesh*; and the *old leaven of malice and wickedness* to be put away instead of that of *Bread*; and a *rest from Sin* of more respect with God than that from *Labour*;) we have instead thereof, *Baptism*, in the room of *Circumcision*; the *Lord's Supper*, in the room of the *Pass-over*; and the *Lords Day*, or *Christian Sabbath*, instead of the Jewish. And, as that took date from the raining of *Manna* after their deliverance from Egypt; so ours from the *Resurrection of Christ*, the true *Manna*.

I agree also that the *Apostle*, and other *Christians*, even after Christ's Resurrection, did go to the *Temple* and the Jewish *Synagogues* on their

74 The CHRISTIAN SABBATH. Part I.

Sabbath days (and did there assist at Prayers, and Reading the Law, and other Services common to Jews and Christians) on a like account as when we now meet to hear a Sermon, or keep a Fast or Thanksgiving on a Week-day.

But so they did as to Circumcision, and other Jewish Rites. As when Paul circumcised Timothy, and joined in the Jewish Rites of Purification, Act. 21. on account of those believing Jews who were yet zealous of the Law: To testify to them that he had been misrepresented by those who said he did teach the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, and that they ought not to circumcise their Children, nor to walk after the Customs. Whereas indeed he taught that the Gentiles ought so to forbear, (as being a new yoke to which before they were not subject,) but as to the Jews which were amongst the Gentiles he did allow them (if not yet satisfied of their Christian Liberty) so to practise. For he puts a great difference between the Gentiles, and the Jews among the Gentiles; of which I doubt our Author doth not take notice; else he would not tell us (p. 39.) of Paul's writing one thing, and practising another. He preached and wrote against Circumcision as to the Gentiles; but allowed it to the Jews; and himself practised it, As to Timothy (a Jew) but not as to Titus who was no Jew. And the like we may say as to the Jewish Sabbath on their Seventh day.

As to what Services were peculiarly Christian (as breaking of Bread) they did it not at the Temple or Synagogues, but *at home, or from house to house*, Act. 2. 46. and on another day, the first day of the Week, Act. 20. 7.

Now this is all that he hath to urge, for the Jewish Sabbath in particular: which he cannot shew to be commanded to all the World (but rather to them in particular in contradistinction to the rest of the World,) nor that it was a Seventh day from the Creation, but from the first raining of Manna. For the Fourth Commandment saith nothing of this Sabbath in particular, but onely of the seventh day after six days of labour.

As to that Imperious demand, p. 40, 48, 64. *Where is there any such Power recorded in Scripture to be given to any Man or Men whatsoever, after Christ had said It is finished, to alter the Seventh-day Sabbath instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ?* I doubt he hath forgotten that the same God who gave the Law of the Ten Commandments, gave also the Ceremonial Law; and if it were the Lord Jesus Christ who gave the one, it was he that gave the other also. And will he then ask *Where is there any power recorded in Scripture to be given to any man or number of men to abolish Circumcision and the rest of the Mosaic Rites* insti-

Part I. The CHRISTIAN SABBATH. 75

*instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ?* I know no such power recorded in Scripture to be given, as to Circumcision and the rest, more than as to the Jewish Sabbath. And we find them both put together Col. 2. 11, 16. Or will he say, *Where is any Power recorded in Scripture to be given to any Man or Men, (after Christ had said It is finished,) to appoint Elders and Deacons and other Officers in the Christian Church, and give Orders concerning it, which Christ (before he so said,) had not given?* Yet we know Circumcision was abolished, and such Officers and Orders given. So that all this is but Flourish.

As to that of Christ having said *It is finished*; whatever be meant by that, we know that the whole Order and Constitution of the Christian Church was settled after that time: And whatever else be signified by it, it is not meant that there was nothing to be done further concerning it; For, if so, to what purpose did Christ give Commandments to his Apostles, of things pertaining to the Kingdom of God after his Resurrection, if nothing were to be further done?

And if we consider the Apostles deportment; We do not find them any where insist *Authoritatively* upon a Power given them from Christ, to Abrogate Circumcision or the like, and thereupon to proceed *pro imperio*. But they argue it from the nature of the thing, That what was Typical of Christ, was at an end now Christ is come; That what was Distinctive of the Jews from other Nations, was now to cease when the partition wall was broken down; That what were but shadows as to the Substantials of Religion, were now to pass away, as beggarly Rudiments, Christ regarding the Body or Substance not the shadows; *τὰ σκία ἢ μυστήρια*, these are but shadows in comparison of what Christ came to settle, *τὸ σῶμα τῆς χάριτος*, but 'tis the Body (the Substance) that Christ respects, Col. 2. 17.

They do not command but argue. They do no where pretend that God or Christ had given them Authority to Abrogate a Law which God had made; But Argue (from the nature of the thing) that the Law was ceased; and was not intended to Oblige longer: That the Law was now Antiquated or Expired when the End for which it was made was attained: That the Types were at an End, when the Thing Typified was Exhibited: That the Distinctive Marks were now no more of Use, when Jews and Gentiles were United: That the Elements or Rudiments (*στοιχεῖα*) which God (for reasons best known to himself) thought fit for the Training up of his Church while in a State of Minority (wherein a Child though Heir of All doth little differ from a Servant) should now cease when it comes to full Age, Gal. 4. And to the same purpose Heb. 8. He argues that the Old Covenant was at an end when a better Covenant was come in

the room; citing that of Jer. 31. *Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a New Covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers when I led them out of the land of Egypt, For this is the Covenant that I will make, That I will put my laws into their Mind, and write them in their Hearts.* Meaning, instead of an outward Ceremonial Service, he would establish a service more Spiritual. From whence he concludes the *Antiquation* of the Former: *In that he saith a New Covenant, he hath made the first Old: Now that which Decayeth and waxeth Old, is ready to Vanish away (or, to expire.)* They do not claim a Power, to *Abolish a Law of Gods making*; But prove by *Argument*, that these Laws are *Antiquated or Expired*; as not being intended, by the Law-maker, to bind longer than till such a time. As Rom. 7. *The Woman is bound by the Law to her Husband as long as he lives; But if the husband be Dead, she is free from the Law: Not that the Law is Abolished; but the Case is Altered.*

And it is from these Considerations that he *Argues* against *Circumcision* Col. 2. 11. and the *Jewish Sabbath*, ver. 16. For as to the *Substantials* of the Service, provided a Sabbath be duly kept, it is much one whether on the *Seventh* or the *First* day. Now these (*Substantials*) are (he tells us p. 83.) *a lively spiritual Converse with the Father, Son and Holy-Ghost, in private Duties and publick Ordinances (where they can be had,) and in a Holy Rest all that day, saving emergent cases of Necessity and Mercy.* Which may be equally done on either day.

But as to those who were not satisfied with these *Arguments*; (if they were such as were before under those Commands) he doth not urge his *Authority*; He leaves them to practise according to their own judgment (but without censuring others) till they shall be better satisfied, as in Rom. 14. But as to the *Gentiles*, who had never been under these Laws, the case was otherwise. Which makes him argue otherwise with the (*Gentile*) *Galatians, Ephesians, and Colossians*, than with the *Christian Jews at Rome*.

And as to his Question, p. 47. *When, where, and by whom*, it was taken away, I say *Then, there, and by the same*, who took away *Circumcision* and the other *Mosaick Rites*. That is, *Fundamentally* by *Christ* at his death *who nailed them to his Cross*, after which they ceased to be *Obligatory*; But *Executively* and *Practically* by his *Apostles*, and the *Christian Church*, according as they did (leisurely and in time) come to understand their *Liberty*.

All which we are to presume they did according to such directions as *Christ* gave them. For (as this Author observes p. 80.) *Paul,*

*in those Primitive times, when the Ceremonial Law was fresh in memory, and the Gospel newly preached, had much a-do to remove the first converted Jews from Circumcision and other Ceremonials, (and so from their Jewish Sabbath;) therefore these things were to wear off by degrees, and not to be torn from them all at once.*

And this I think is enough (to a person not prejudiced) as to the *Removal of the (then) Jewish Sabbath*; appointed by *Moses* after their coming out of *Egypt*, on the *seventh day* from the *first raining of Manna*, and not given to all the world, but to be a *distinctive sign* of them from other Nations.

Now as to the other Point in Question, the *Observation of the Lords day*: I would ground that originally on the *Fourth Commandment*; which doth appoint a *Seventh day of Holy Rest*, after *Six days of Ordinary Labour*. Which doth directly concern the *Substantials* of *Worship* (that a Sabbath be kept and God thus served), but whether on this or that day of the *Seven*, is merely *Circumstantial*, and (as *Paul* calls it) a *Shadow*, in comparison of the *Body or Substance*, which is, he tells us, what *Christ* respects.

But then as to that, *Why the First day* rather than another? I answer, *First*, Here was a much more memorable Accident, of *Christs Resurrection*; than was that of *Raining Manna*, from whence the *Jewish Sabbath* takes its date, as the *Seventh day* from it (not from the *Creation*) or that of the *Quails* the Night before, (the first day that God fed them by Miracle from Heaven,) And therefore stands as fair for beginning such a Circulation of Weeks and Sabbaths.

We are told Jer. 16. 14, 15. and Jer. 23, 7, 8. *Behold the days come (saith the Lord) that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; But, The Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel out of the North Country.* Not, that the former deliverance was to be forgotten; but a greater than it did make it (comparatively) to disappear (as when the light of the Sun doth obscure that of the Moon and Stars;) And so here, the *Resurrection of Christ* to be commemorated paramount to that of former Mercies.

Next, in pursuance of this Occasion, we find our Saviour did on that day of his *Resurrection*, appear to *Mary Magdalen* and the other Women, declaring to them the *Doctrine of the Resurrection*; then, to the two Disciples going to *Emmaus*, Preaching to them (at large) the same Doctrine, and Celebrating with them the *Lords Supper*; and afterward (the same day) to those assembled at *Jerusalem* (with other Sabbatical works) and solemnly *Blessing* that Convention. And if our Author by *blessing the Seventh day* Gen. 2. would have us understand

stand an *Institution* or *Command* to observe it; We have as much here; Christ joined in this Assembly, and *Blessed* it. For so much is intimated in that his solemn *Benediction* (a first and second time, *Joh. 20. 19, 21.*) *Peace be unto you; and he breathed on them saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.*

He did so a second time on the same day the next Week; he *Assembled* with them (in Religious Services) and *Blessed* them.

He did (according to his Promise made on that first day of his Resurrection) send on them that miraculous *Effusion of the Holy Ghost* on the day of *Pentecost*, which being the Fiftieth day from his Resurrection, was therefore the *first day of the week* as was that of the Resurrection. On which day of *Pentecost* we find them also otherwise exercised in Religious Employments, and attested further by a miraculous conversion of *three thousand souls*.

We find St. Paul at *Troas* *Act. 20. Preaching to the Disciples assembled* (as it seems their manner was) *on the first day of the week to break bread*; that is, to celebrate the *Lords Supper*.

That such Assemblies were wont to be at *Corinth*, on the first day of the Week, the Apostle presumes, or takes for granted; and gives direction for a *Collection* to be then made, *1 Cor. 16.*

And he had done so before, as he there signifies, to the *Churches of Galatia*; presuming or taking for granted, that they also did so use to meet on the first day of the Week.

And we have no reason to doubt but that such meetings were wont to be in other Churches. We cannot doubt but that other of the Apostles did disperse themselves into other parts of the World, though we have not a like account of their Travels, as we have of Paul's recorded by St. Luke: But we are to presume (though it be not recorded) that their Doctrine and Practice was consonant to his; and that accordingly they had such weekly meetings on the Lord's Day, as these Churches had of whom we have the History.

Hence that day had the name given of the *Lord's-day*, *κύριος ημεραν*, as we find it called *Rev. 1. 10.* (as that of the Sacrament is called *δείπνον κυριακόν* the *Lord's Supper*, *1 Cor. 11. 20.*) which name it retaineth to this day, and for such purpose.

And all this, I think, is sufficient for us to continue our Observation of the same day. I am sure 'tis much more than he can shew for his *seventh-day Sabbath* for more than *two thousand five hundred years* from the first Creation.

It is not necessary that we have express words of Command recorded: We have no Record in Scripture of such express words of Command for the *seventh-day Sabbath*, till after *Israel's coming out of Egypt*;

nor

nor for the *Worshipping of God by Sacrifice*; nor for other things which yet were *Duties* before any *Record* of such express words of Command. It is enough if we can otherwise collect it to be God's Will, according to the best light we have.

If this Gentleman think himself obliged to keep the Jewish Sabbath also: this doth not hurt us. This, I think, was the case of the *Christian Jews* at first. I do not much question but that they did, as other Christians, observe the Lord's Day. The doubt was, whether they were not to observe also the Jewish Sabbath as before they did. And these *Believers* who were yet *zealous of the Law*, and thought themselves obliged, *together with Christianity*, to observe the *Law of Moses*, did no doubt think themselves equally obliged to the *Jewish Sabbath*. Those who thought themselves obliged to be *Baptized*, and to be *Circumcised* also, thought themselves in like manner obliged to observe the *Lord's Day* and also the *Jewish Sabbath*. And (till they should be better satisfied) the Apostles permit (the Jews) so to do.

If this do not satisfy him; I have yet two Expedients for him.

1. Let him begin his Week on *Monday*, and then *Sunday* will be the *Seventh-day*. Whether the Seventh in course from the Creation, I cannot tell; nor can any man living inform me. But it will at least be the *Seventh* day of *His Week*.

2. If he be not satisfied with this: My next Expedient is thus. Let him take a Voyage round the World, as Sir *Francis Drake* did. Going out of the *Atlantic Ocean* West-ward by the Streights of *Magellan* to the *East-Indies*; and then, from the East, returning by the *Cape of Good Hope* (the usual way) homeward. And take with him as many as please of those who are of his mind. And let them keep their *Saturday-sabbath* all the way. When they come home to *England*, they will find their *Saturday* to fall upon our *Sunday*; and they may thenceforth continue to observe their *Saturday-sabbath* on the same day with us. Which is the second Expedient.

If you ask, How this can be? I will make it very plain, that so it will be, and so it must be. For, Supposing the Earth to be Round, and the Sun moving from East to West; you must allow that it comes sooner to the Eastern parts than to the Western. It will sooner be *Noon* in *Holland* than in *England*, and sooner here than in *Ireland*.

If you ask, How much sooner? We say, that *Fifteen Degrees* of Longitude West-ward, makes it an *Hour* later. As if he Embark about *Dover*, *Yarmouth*, or other Port on the East-side of *England*, and Sail as far West-ward as the West of *Ireland* (or a little farther) it will be an *Hour* later, and not be *Noon* there till it be *One a clock*

at

at the place where he Embarked. And so in proportion, an *Hour* for every *Fifteen degrees*. And accordingly, when he hath gone round the whole Circle of *Three hundred and Sixty Degrees*, (that is Four and twenty times Fifteen,) it will be later by *Four and twenty hours*, That is, it will be but *Saturday-noon* with him, when it is *Sunday-noon* with those who staid here. That is, His *Saturday* will be Our *Sunday*. And thenceforth his *Saturday-Sabbath* will be the same day with our *Sunday-Sabbath* ever after.

And this, I think, should fully satisfy him. For he tells us, p. 39. *The variety of the time of the Sun-rising or setting in different Climates doth no way disturb; for that a day longer or shorter is still a day, and but a day.*

Most certain it is he who shall have thus sailed round the World will have had one day fewer than those who staid here. So it was with Sir *Francis Drake* and his Company: And so it hath been with all who have taken such a Voyage, (as many have done, for it is not a rare case:) and so will be to any who shall so do.

What he would resolve upon this case, or what he thinks Sir *Francis Drake* was to do when this happened; I cannot tell.

If he would go on to reckon the days according as they had happened to him in his Voyage; then this Expedient must fully satisfy him. For then he keeps his *Saturday-Sabbath* on our *Sunday*.

If he thinks the account should be rectified when or before he comes home, and call the days thenceforth as he finds those to do that staid here, what shall be come of that day he hath lost? and which day of the Week shall he reckon that to be?

And, When must he rectify that account? when he comes home, or somewhere by the way? For it would be just the same, if, before he come at *England*, he should have landed in *France* or *Spain*, or on the Coast of *Africk*, or even at the *East-Indies*; and all the way from thence, he would still be a day behind them. And so he would be with every Ship that in his way he should meet with. If he and such other Ship meet at the Isle of St. *Helens* to take fresh water, his *Saturday* will be their *Sunday*; and on which of the two days are they to keep their *Sabbath*? or must they keep it one on the one day, and the other on the other?

If he say that the account is to be rectified by the way (before he comes home) then Where? or When? and by What rule? For when ever he doth so rectify it, he must then begin to call *Sunday* what just before he was to call *Saturday*.

If he say, This must be left to Discretion, when, and where: Then must it be matter of discretion (and not determin'd by the Fourth Commandment) on which of the two days in question the *Sabbath* shall be kept.

But then here will again come in our amazing doubt (as p. 48, 86, 87.) *What man or men, without an high Usurpation of the Divine Authority, contrary to the First Commandment, shall pretend good intentions, assume an authority of their own heads, to appoint (for this or that place; suppose the Streights of Magellan) what day shall be the Lords holy Sabbath? Who, but our Lord Jesus Christ, that is Lord of the Sabbath, hath power to institute a Sabbath-day? If the Church or any part thereof be once admitted to have such Power, what Bolts or Locks will be strong enough for such a Door, to keep it from letting in upon the Churches of Christ whatsoever pleaseth those in Power?*

I shall not much trouble myself to answer all this Warmth. But (when that is over) if at or near the *Streights of Magellan* (a place, I think, not inhabited, or not by Christian,) a Colony be planted by some from hence, and some from the *East-Indies*; those who come thither from hence will (according to their account) call that *Saturday*, which those who come thither from the other side will (according to their account) call *Sunday*: Must they have no Sabbath at all? (that's against the Fourth Commandment:) Or must they by consent agree upon the day? (this I should think, if he would give me leave:) Or must they keep it some upon one day some on the other? This I would by no means advise, if it may be avoided: Because it would be a manifest confusion and disorder; And they would not both (if either) be the *Seventh-day* in course from the Creation: And which of them is so, is not possible for any man to know. And it would be more for common Edification that they do agree upon a common day. And not much matter, whether of the Two.

This Gentleman, if he can consider of it calmly, I am apt to think will be of the same mind; and think it better to have such a Sabbath than none at all; and that the little circumstance, whether on this or that day, should be disregarded in comparison of the Substantials of the Duty.

There be many things which the *Word of God* or the *Divine Law* doth determine in *These*, which when in *Hypothesis* they come in practice, will require the intervention of *Prudentials* or *Humane Laws*. The Eighth Commandment says, I must not *Steal*, or take unduly from my Neighbour what is His: But, What is Mine, and what is my Neighbours, will depend much upon Humane Laws; and, what shall be reputed a Trespass on my Neighbours land; or, a forfeiture of his right. The Seventh Commandment says, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*: But it will depend much upon Humane Law, what shall be reputed a Good Marriage. The Sixth Commandment says *Thou shalt not Kill*: But it will much depend upon Humane Law what shall be re-

puted Self-defense, or a Just War, or a Forfeiture of Life. The Fifth Commandment requires us to *Honour and Obey our Parents*; But, in many cases, 'tis Humane Law that is to determine, who is to be reputed the Father. If a Widow be left with Child by a former Husband, and marry another before that Child be born (which sometime happens;) 'twill be a point in Law, not in Divinity, to whether of the Two Fathers this Son shall be Heir. And if my Father require me to part with what Estate is my own, 'twill be a point in Law, how far I am required to obey such a Command. (And the like as to other *Superiours*, as well as *Natural Parents*.) And those Laws which seem Absolute (as *Thou shalt not Kill*, *Thou shalt not Steal*, &c.) Have yet their Tacite *Limitations* implied. For no man doubts but there are cases wherein to *Kill* may be lawful; as in *Self-defense*, in a *just War*, and for *Capital Crimes*; And in such cases, to take from our Neighbour what was His. And, notwithstanding the Command of *Honour thy Father and Mother*, or that of *Children obey your Parents in all things*; there may things happen, wherein we are not obliged to do what they bid us. And in all such cases there is room for *Prudence* to interpose. Not, to Abrogate or Repeal a Law of God; But to judge what is the true Intent of that Law. So notwithstanding that Command of the Sabbath, *In it thou shalt do no manner of work*; yet our Saviour tells us, *The Priests in the Temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless*; and against the Pharisees *superstitious rigour* he argues, not onely from his own Authority (*The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath-day*) But from the Reason of the Law, *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath*; and consequently is so to be understood as may be for the *Good of Man* (spiritual and bodily) not for his *Hurt*. And our Author allows the *emergent cases of Necessity and Mercy*; And no man doubts but that if a *House be on Fire*, we may *Labour to quench it*. In all which cases *Prudence* may be used, but must not (upon that pretense) be *Abused*. Not as if it were left to our *Prudence*, whether or no the Law of God shall be Obeyed; But, what is, in such cases, the true *Intendment* of the Law of God. And there needs no other *Locks or Bolts*. (as our Author speaks) to confine *Prudence* in such cases, than in all other *Prudential Acts*. So when the Fourth Commandment requires us to *keep holy the Sabbath-day*; it may yet, in many cases, depend much upon *Prudence* or *Humane Laws*, which day shall be reputed the *Sabbath*. And if this Author tell us, it must be the *Seventh* in course from the *Creation*; We are never a whit the nearer. For though he take great pleasure, on all occasions, to exclaim against *Tradition*; yet he must admit a *great deal of Tradition* to intervene before he can prove this or that day to be a *Seventh* in course from the *Creation*.

I am apt to think also, that when he hath well consider'd the case of *Sr. Francis Drake* (and many more since that time, who sailing round the world, as he did, have lost a day,) he will come to one of these two Resolutions: Either that when he comes back to *England* he must continue to call that *Saturday* which on his account was so; (and then his *Saturday-sabbath* will be the same with our *Sunday*;) Or else that his account must be somewhere rectified in his Voyage by skipping a day; and then and there beginning to call *Sunday* what, just before, he was to call *Saturday*.

Now because there is nothing in Nature to determine where this must be; nor is there any thing of Divine Institution (that I know of) to determine where it shall be; It seems to me to be Prudential, or most rational, (if nothing intervene to counterbalance it,) to be at what we call the *first Meridian*, from whence we reckon the Degrees of Longitude, Eastward, 1, 2, 3, &c. and so onward till we come round to 360, at the same Meridian again; and thence begin to reckon onward 1, 2, 3, &c. as before, for another round.

This first Meridian, in *Ptolemy's* time, was accounted to be about the Western part of the *African* shore; as being the most Western part of the World then known. Of later times, Geographers have been pleased to remove it more West, about the Islands called *Azores*, or the *Flemish Islands*. But all agree to place it between our Continent and that of *America*. And if from that Meridian, from whence we reckon the beginning of Longitude, we reckon also the beginning of Days; then the last of *Saturday* must there end, and the first of *Sunday* must there begin. And therefore at that Meridian the sailors round the World should rectify their account, calling it *Saturday* on the one side of it, and *Sunday* on the other; that being the *latest* of *Saturday*, and the *soonest* of *Sunday*.

He will tell me perhaps, that, by this account, if *We* keep our Sabbath on *Sunday*, those in *New-England* must be said to keep theirs on *Monday*, as being on the other side of that Meridian. And 'tis true, it would so follow. And therefore I did interpose, *if nothing else do intervene to counterbalance it*. And this is what I did at first intimate, as disputable, whether we and they in *New-England* are to be said to keep our Sabbath on the same day.

But it is the same case as to the whole Continent of *America*. And the same resolution will reach all.

And therefore, the thing being once settled by the common consent of all, I would by no means advise to change the day.

For the placing the *first Meridian* is purely *Arbitrary*. It might as well have been placed beyond *America*, (if men had so pleased, and

and that *America* had been known in *Ptolemy's* time) as on this side: (And we might have numbred our Degrees of Longitude Westward, as now we do Eastward:) And may be so reputed now, if men so please (as it is now reputed about 10 or 15 degrees more to the Westward than it was in *Ptolemy's* days.)

And it is purely *Arbitrary*, where to begin to change the name of the day which is to be so called; whether at the First Meridian, or else-where.

And consequently 'tis purely *Arbitrary* or *Discretional*, whether in *America* such day shall be called *Sunday* or *Monday*. There is nothing in the *fourth Commandment*, nor in the *Word of God*, to determine it.

But it so happening, that *America* hath been peopled from *Europe*, traveling Westward from hence (without taking notice that we cross the first Meridian,) we have reckoned the days (and so named them) according as they appeared to those upon their Voyage who went thither. Whereas if it had been peopled (I mean, as to the Christians there) from *Asia* and the *East-Indies* (by people coming thence to the other side of *America*) what there is now called *Sunday*, would (for the like reason) have been called *Monday*: and the Fourth Commandment equally observed either way.

And upon a like account Christians in the *East-Indies*, and in *China* and *Japan*, traveling Eastward from hence thither, do call their days there according as they appeared to fall out to them in the course of their Voyage.

Now 'tis true, that some part of the day which we here call *Sunday*, is coincident with some part of what is so called in *Japan*, and also some part of our *Sunday* (though not the same part) is coincident with part of theirs in *America*. But very little of theirs in the East of *Japan*, with theirs in the West of *America*. About Eleven a clock at night in the one (or yet later) before it begins to be one a clock in the morning in the other, (scarce an hour in common) according to our ancient Maps. (Our later Maps make it somewhat more, as if it might be Ten at night in the one, when it begins to be Two in the morning at the other.) Yet these pass for the same *Sunday*. And 'tis well enough so to reckon.

But it is *Prudentially* so: Because the chief Trade and intercourse of *America*, is with *Europe*; not with *Asia*. And therefore it is considered as lying *West* from *Europe*; rather than as *East* from *Japan*. And accordingly it is so placed in our Maps. And though we continue to reckon our *Longitude* as from a Meridian between *Us* and *America*, yet the account of our days we begin as from a Meridian beyond it, between *America* and *Asia*.

Which

## Part I. The CHRISTIAN SABBATH. 85

Which is not said to raise *new scruples*, (as if I would advise an alteration of a received computation; which is well enough as it is; and I know not how to mend it:) But to shew there is an unavoidable Necessity of leaving much to *Prudential* considerations, What day shall be reputed *Sunday*, and what the *Sabbath*, in this or that place. And therefore it cannot reasonably be thought the design of the *fourth Commandment* to confine us to such *Circumstantial* *Niceties*, which do not at all influence the *Substantials* of *Worship*.

The *fourth Commandment* requires the *seventh* day of *Holy Rest*, after *six* days of ordinary *Labour*. But of a *Seventh* day in course from the *Creation* to be so observed, it saith nothing: Nor is it possible for us to know. The *Jews* observed a *seventh* day in course from the first raining of *Manna*; but I do not know how this concerns us; or, if it did, how we shall know which is that day? (for this Gentleman will not allow *Tradition* to be a good proof.) We observe a *seventh* day in course from what (we think) the *Apostles* did observe. If we mistake our reckoning (which I think we do not) it is not a *Culpable* Ignorance; for it is according to the best Light we have. This day we are in possession of, and the Christian Church hath so been for many *Hundred* years. And he that would dispossess us of it, must shew a better Title. (The old rule is, *Possidentis potior est ratio*.) To change merely for change sake, is Foolish. If he would lay a *Divine Necessity* on us to observe the *Jewish Sabbath* from the first raining of *Manna* (if at least that be the day by them observed in our Saviour's time;) he must make it clear to us, which is that day (by a better argument, if he can, than *Tradition*;) And, that we are of necessity obliged to that day; which was (himself acknowledges) a *distinctive* sign of them from other Nations, as *Circumcision* also was. And if this *distinctive* mark (when the partition wall is broken down) do as much cease as that did: 'Tis as truly *superstition* now to put a necessity upon it, as upon *Circumcision*. Which though the *Apostles* would, for a while, permit to the *Jews*; (to whom it had once been a Law) till they should be better satisfied; Yet would by no means allow to the *Gentiles*, to whom it had not before been a Law. And I think the case is just the same of the *Jewish Sabbath* as contradicting to the *Lord's Day*.

I am

Yours, &c.

FINIS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

*Theological Discourses* (of the same Author) in Two Parts. The former containing Eight Letters and Three Sermons concerning the Trinity: The latter containing Sermons and other Treatises on divers Occasions. Are Printed for Thomas Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside near Mercers-Chappel.

DEFENSE  
CHRISTIANITY

HEM ALDRICH

Vice-Chancellor

CHRISTIANITY

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Imprimatur,

HEN. ALDRICH,

Vice-Can. Oxon.

Junij 20<sup>o</sup>.?  
1694. S

A  
D E F E N S E

OF THE

*Christian Sabbath.*

PART the SECOND.

BEING

A REJOINDER to Mr. Bampffield's REPLY

TO

Doctor WALLIS's DISCOURSE

Concerning The

CHRISTIAN-SABBATH.

BY

JOHN WALLIS, D.D. And Professor of Geometry  
in the University of OXFORD.

OXFORD,

Printed by L. Lichfield, for Thomas Bennet, at the Half-Moon  
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, LONDON. 1694.

DEFENSE

OF THE  
*Christian Sabbath.*  
ADVERTISEMENT.

THE First Edition, of the First Part, being Dispersed, and Scarce to be had; Care was taken to Re-print it, in the Second Edition, (with very little Alteration) Page for Page, so as not to Disorder the Citations.

TO  
DOCTOR WALLIS'S DISCOURSE

Concerning The  
CHRISTIAN SABBATH

BY  
JOHN WALLIS D.D. And Professor of Geometry  
in the University of OXFORD.

OXFORD  
Printed by J. Stanger, for Thomas Bland, at the Ship  
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, LONDON.

A  
DISCOURSE

Concerning The  
Christian Sabbath.

PART the SECOND.

BEING

*A Rejoinder to Mr. BAMPFIELD's Reply.*

SIR,

WHEN I answered your former Book, which you call *An Enquiry*, &c. I did not know who was the Author of it, (or that you had entertained that Opinion,) and therefore could not pay you those Respects that otherwise I should have done. For though I had made Enquiry as I had opportunity at *Oxford*, of many there, (and particularly some of your good friends, and Non-Conformists, whom I thought most likely to know,) they all agreed that it was not Mr. *Bampfild* the Counsellor at Law, but some relation of yours. Nor was I rectified therein, till (a great while after my book was abroad) when I was informed by another good friend of yours (Mr. *P.F.*) that it was your Book. And I am not sorry (for some reasons) that I did not know it sooner.

However; it was not the Man, but the Doctrine, that I was to answer: And if, in so doing, I did not pay you those respects I would otherwise allow you; yet I hope there is nothing in it Undecent or Unbecoming a fair Disputant.

You observe (*Rep. p. 1.*) that I had said (in my *Discourse* p. 1.) That *I would not* (for my own part) give any Disturbance (or such

A

such account) to the Peace and Practice of the Church where I live, so that a Sabbath be duly observed, though perhaps not upon what day I should choose: Which I find doth give you some disturbance, and it will take up some time to answer your Query's about it. I am of the same opinion still. For Reasons I then gave, p. 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, (To which you make no Reply.) Because I think the *Substantials* of a Duty, are of greater moment, and more intended in the Commands of God, than the *Circumstantials* that do attend it; and these upon occasion to give way to those.

I gave you many precedents to this purpose, p. 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, &c. *Circumcision* was, by the Institution, to be performed on the *Eighth day*: but in case it were then omitted, it might be done the next day, or some time after, rather than not at all. *Abraham* was 99 years old, and *Ishmael* 13, and the other Males in *Abraham's* family of several ages when they were at once Circumcised, *Gen.* 17. 10, 23. And Proselytes were circumcised at any Age.

And Circumcision, (you know) was omitted in the Wilderness for forty years together (as inconvenient by reason of their uncertain travels) and those who were born during that time were at once Circumcised at *Gilgal*, *Josh.* 5. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. And *Timothy* was doubtless more than eight days old, when *Paul* caused him to be Circumcised, because his Mother was a Jew. *Act.* 16. 1. And all this notwithstanding your great Objection, No other day Com-manded, no Promise to any other, nor Threatning for the omission.

The Passover was, by the Institution, to be kept on the fourteenth day of the first month; but *Hezekiah* (when it could not conveniently be done in the first Month) kept it in the second month, instead of the first (after it had been a long time intermitted,) 2 *Chron.* 30. 2, 3.

The Jews had their Feasts of the New-Moons; but were at great uncertainties (as I there shewed, p. 11, 12.) as to one, two, or three days; and it was left much to the Priests discretion, which of those days should be reputed the day of the New-moon, yet was not the Service to be neglected; but to be performed, if not on the just day, at least on the reputed day of the New-moon. And no scruple (that I know of) was made upon it. Of which you may consult, if you please, Mr. *Selden's* Treatise *De Anno Civili Veterum Judeorum*. The Jews, I presume, have at this day *Kalendars* as other People have; and that some of their later Rabbins, since *Ptolemy's* time, have Tables of the Motions of the Sun and Moon borrowed from him; But we are here speak-

speaking of the times of *Moses*, and thence downward to *Christ's* time. And that they had then such *Kalendars*, I do not know, nor do believe. They had no doubt at that time a Solar Year (how exact, I know not,) according to which they judged of the Equinox, and of their Summer and Winter and Seed-time and Harvest: But their Feasts did depend on their Lunar Year, which was very uncertain; sometimes of Twelve sometime of Thirteen Months; and the beginnings of these Months very uncertain.

And the same uncertainty did affect the Pass-over also: For if the day of the New-moon were uncertain, it must be equally uncertain which should be the fourteenth day on which the Pass-over was to be kept. And we know *Christ* with his Disciples did eat his last Pass-over on One day, and the Jews on Another; which could not both be on the fourteenth day from the true New Moon; but were both so reputed, one by him, the other by them. And I do not find it blamed in either. I suppose you will not blame *Christ* and his Disciples. And I would not blame the other, because I find that God's Providence so ordered it that on this day *Christ* (the Antitype and true Paschal Lamb) was Crucified; not on the day when himself did eat the Pass-over. I would rather conclude from both, that the nicety of a Day was not then thought so considerable as to vitiate the Service.

And this of the Day might so happen as to make the Month uncertain also: For if the Full-Moon happened near the Equinox, it was much at the Priests discretion, whether it should be reputed the thirteenth Month of the year Past, or the first Month of the year Coming. To all which (and much more) you make no Reply at all.

And as to Circumstances, even in other Institutions, they may be part of the Narrative, when they are no parts of the Institution: As, in the Institution of the Lords Supper, that it was in an Upper Room, and After Supper, &c.

And, when in the first Institution, some Circumstantials were but Occasional (as to that Time and Place) they may cease to be Obligatory, when the case is altered: As, in the Pass-over, that it was to be eaten standing, with their Loins Girt, and Staves in their Hands, as in haste to be gone; and not to stir out of the House till morning, *Exod.* 12. 11, 22. Notwithstanding which, *Christ* with his Disciples (at his last Pass-over) did eat it sitting or rather lying, and went the same night to Mount Olivet, *Mat.* 26. 20, 30, 36.

For which considerations, with others of like nature, I think the difference of a day in many cases so inconsiderable, in com-

parison with the Substantials of a Duty, as that I would not on this account give disturbance, though not upon the day that I should choose.

But *What day I would choose*, you say, *you know not*. And you seem to *Hope*, *Rep.* p. 2. and *Think*, and *Judge*, and would have it thought, that *I would Choose your seventh day Sabbath*: and this *after the best judgment you can make of my book*, (for which reason I shall less trust to your Judgment another time,) and insinuate (broadly enough) p. 62. as if I did *but espouse a notion* (against my own judgment) *by which I have a benefit*, and, for fear to loose or endanger that benefit, do employ my learning and ingenuity to cavil at you, and the direct will and word of God, and *Teach the contrary*; notwithstanding my doubts and scruples; and p. 74. that I do it *for some worldly advantage*: whereas you *Hope* and *Think* and *Judge* that (if left to my own choice) I am really of your mind. And you have the confidence *Rep.* p. 18. to desire that *the Doctor who is very able* would undertake your cause: As if you thought me one of those who may be indifferently retained on either side as there is occasion: (but, however, to be retained on both sides is not fair practice.) With many hard censures all along. (I believe that (till now) you had a better opinion of me. Have I lost all my reputation with you for not approving your Saturday-Sabbath?) I should not have expected that Mr. Bampffield would have thus insinuated without any ground, and take it to be more uncharitable than all the hard Words you complain of (p. 63.) from Mr. Tros. (Which yet are most of them your own.) I am so charitable as to think Mr. Bampffield (though in an Error) doth argue according to his own judgment, not for worldly advantages contrary thereunto.

But, to put you out of Doubt (and answer your surmise) I will tell you, (without hesitation, and without doubt or scruple.)

I would choose (if it were left to my choice) that Day which I think the Apostles did observe, and the Christian Churches in their time, (and ever since,) which (in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath) they called *the Lords Day*; and *the first day of the week*, or *the first day after the (Jewish) Sabbath*. And the middle part of this day, being the chief time for Action or Business (suppose from Sun-rising to Sun-setting,) I should take to be the middle-part of such Sabbath-day; taking into it, so much Backward (toward the Mid-night last past) and so much Forward (toward the Mid-night ensuing) as is wont to be accounted *time of business* (or the *dies practicus*;) and that so much of the time (be-

tween

tween mid-night and mid-night) as is to be *time of business* should (on that day) be employed in *Religious business* (as, on other days, it is or may be employed in *Civil business*;) and so much of it (next after the mid-night past, and next before the mid-night following,) as is reasonably to be allowed for *Natural Rest*, should on this day be a Relaxation from *Religious business*, as on other days from *Civil business*. This is the Day I would choose; and thus bounded.

But if I were in *New-England*, where (I am told) they use to begin their Sabbath on Saturday-night about Sun-set: I would then and there comply with the practice I there find, rather than give them any Offense or Disturbance therein. For I do not think it the design of the Fourth Commandment, to descend to such Punctilio's; but rather that the Sabbath-day should be so reckoned and so bounded, as other days are reputed to be.

But I have somewhat further to add to this purpose, upon consideration of the Scheme you give us, (*Repl.* p. 71, 72, 73.) for the accounting of Days.

You please to *begin or set forth* (as you say) at *Jerusalem*; (And why so, but because you please? Another perhaps would choose to begin at the *First Meridian*, or elsewhere. But, be it as you please.) From *Jerusalem* you begin your account on *Saturday Mar. 11. 1693*, and bring your account round the Earth to *Jerusalem* again. From hence Westward 15 degrees, will be *Saturday* still, but an hour later than at *Jerusalem*; and 15 degrees further, will be two hours later but still the same day; and so onward, for every fifteen degrees, allowing an hour. And accordingly at *Rome* (you tell us) it will be *Saturday* still, but two hours later than at *Jerusalem*. At *London*, *Saturday* will be 3 hours and 12 minutes later than at *Jerusalem*. At *Dublin*, about 3 hours and 32 minutes later than at *Jerusalem*. And passing on to *New-England*, (though in so passing you cross the first Meridian) it shall yet be *Saturday*, but later by eight hours than at *Jerusalem*. (Whether these be the just distances of those Meridians, is not material; but we will take them so to be.) Thence passing onward to *Japan*, it will there be *Saturday* still (or the seventh day) *March 11.* but later by 17 hours than at *Jerusalem*. And from *Japan*, You say (to pass over the other Meridians and rest of the land in Asia) about seven hours. (That is, in *China*, *India*, *Persia*, *Babylon*, *Syria*, &c. 'tis still *Saturday Mar. 11.* but later and later, till in 7 hours more we come from *Japan* to *Jerusalem* again.) And, because 17 and 7 are 24, when we come to *Jerusalem* again, we are then to call it *Sunday March 12*; but till

till we come there, it must yet be *Saturday March 11*, though perhaps 23 *hours* (or more than so) later than at *Jerusalem*. And this, I think, you will not deny to be a just account of your Scheme, according to your own mind, *Rep. p. 73.* though in somewhat fewer words.

And according to this Scheme, at *Sinai, Jordan, and Mount Olivet*, (for we are not yet come to *Jerusalem*, all these places being Eastward from it,) it must yet be *Saturday March 11.* later by almost 24 *hours* than at *Jerusalem*. And particularly at *Mount Sinai* (which is, you tell us, 6 *degrees* Eastward from *Jerusalem*, that is, 24 *minutes* of time) it must yet be *Saturday, March 11*, but later than at *Jerusalem* by 23 *hours* and 36 *minutes*. At *Mount Olivet*, it must yet be *Mar. 11.* (for we are yet short of *Jerusalem*) but later by almost 24 *hours* (wanting less than one *minute*.) So that, if Christ did eat the Pass-over, on *Thursday* the Thirteenth day of the first month, and after went to *Mount Olivet*, it would there be but *Wednesday* the Twelfth day; and when he came back to *Jerusalem*, it was there again *Thursday* the Thirteenth, and if he had returned back again to *Mount Olivet* the same night, it would now again be but *Wednesday* the Twelfth.

But you may remember that you told us before (*Rep. p. 67, 68, 69.*) that though *the Sun* travel *Westward*, yet *the Posterity of Adam and Noah* did travel (not only *Westward*, but) *East, West, North and South, over-spreading the Earth*; and wherever they came (Eastward or Westward) after *Six days* of travel or other work, as *the Sun* did set, their *Sabbath* was to begin. (I will not trouble you with *Greenland*, where if they must wait till *Sun-set*, they must have no Sabbath for divers Months together.)

Now those who travel Eastward from *Jerusalem* must therefore reckon the same day, *fifteen degrees Eastward*, to be an hour sooner than at *Jerusalem*, and so in proportion the further they go; one hour for every *fifteen degrees*. And your self give us a precedent of such reckoning (*p. 71.*) at *Sinai* (being about *six degrees* of Longitude Eastward from *Jerusalem*) the *seventh day* at *Sinai* was about 24 *Minutes* sooner than at *Jerusalem*, yet was the *Seventh day* at both.

Let us now begin where you left, that is, at *Sunday Mar. 12. 1692* at *Jerusalem*. This at *Sinai* will be *Sunday* (the same day) but 24 *minutes* sooner than at *Jerusalem*, as you tell us, *pag. 71*; But, according to your other account, *pag. 73.* it was to be *Saturday* 23 *hours* and 36 *minutes* later than at *Jerusalem*. And whether of the two reckonings must we follow? And at *Japan*, 'twill  
be

be the same day (*Sunday*) but earlier by 7 *hours* than at *Jerusalem*. And at *New-England*, the same day (*Sunday*) will be *sixteen hours* sooner than at *Jerusalem*. And *Sunday* at *Rome* will be 22 *hours* sooner than at *Jerusalem*. And so onward till you come to *Jerusalem* again. But then (and not till then) instead of calling it *Sunday Mar. 12. 24 hours* sooner than at *Jerusalem*, we must call it *Saturday Mar. 11. at Jerusalem*: Which is a just account, according to your own Scheme, as to those who travel Eastward; or so reckon as if they did so travel.

So that, at *Japan*, (according to your two accounts) it is indifferent whether to call it *Saturday 17 hours* later, according to *pag. 73.* or *Sunday 7 hours* sooner than at *Jerusalem*, according to *pag. 71.* And at *New-England*, 'tis indifferent whether to call it *Saturday eight hours* later, or *Sunday 16 hours* sooner, than at *Jerusalem*: for 'tis just the same time either way.

But, notwithstanding this indifference, I would, as to *New-England*, comply with your Scheme *pag. 73.* and call it (as you do) *Saturday eight hours* later, (though in going thither we cross the first Meridian,) because in *New-England* they do so account their days. But, as to *Japan*, I would not comply with you, to call it *Saturday seventeen hours* later, but would choose to call it *Sunday seven hours* sooner than at *Jerusalem*; because, at *Japan*, they do so account their days. And therefore though I do acknowledge (as you speak *Repl. p. 2.*) that *the Word is the Rule of Worship*; yet I would here be guided by *the Practice of the place*, (for the Word hath herein determined nothing either way) which practice therefore I would not disturb.

And this doth furnish a *Third Expedient* (beside the Two which I gave you before) by travelling to *Japan*. For what you call *Saturday* (or *the Seventh day*) *seventeen hours* later, will be the same with what they call *Sunday* (or *the first day*,) *seven hours* sooner than at *Jerusalem*. That is, Your *Saturday-sabbath*, will be the same with their *Sunday-sabbath*. Or if to *Japan* be too great a Journey, 'twill be the same case if you go but to *China, East-India, Persia, Babylon*, or but to *Syria*, or any place Eastward to *Jerusalem*.

But (in erecting this Scheme, and setting out from *Jerusalem* Westward, reckoning *Mar. 11.* till we come round to *Jerusalem* again) you do it, you say, *without setting a Meridian*; I suppose, by *Meridian*, you mean without setting a *First Meridian* (for otherwise every place hath its *Meridian*;) But in thus reckoning you do (though you be not aware of it) make this a *first Meridian*.

ridian. For, a *first Meridian* is that from whence we reckon 1, 2, 3, &c. till at 360 we come round thither again. For, so reckoning, makes this (to you) the *first Meridian*. Onely you reckon from thence 1, 2, 3, &c. *Westward*: whereas others do so reckon from their *First Meridian Eastward*. But in pag. 71. you so reckon *Eastward* as others do. Both which make it a *first Meridian*.

I have but one thing more here to note and I shall dismiss this point. And it is your prudent choice of the *Equinoctial day*, when the days and nights be equal all the World over. For if you had pitched upon any other day than one of the two *Equinoxes*, the *Obliquity of Horizons* (as you are well aware, *Rep.* p. 70.) would quite have spoiled your reckoning. For though, to all under the same Meridian, it be *Mid-day* at the same time, and *Mid-night* likewise; yet *sun-rising*, and *sun-setting* be at very different times, even to those under the same *Meridian*. And accordingly the Sabbath not to begin, at all times of the year, at *Rome, London, New-England, &c.* so long before or after that at *Jerusalem*, as your *scheme* appoints. But I shall press this no farther.

But thus much is undeniably evident from your own Scheme, that, at *Japan* for instance, or Mount *Sinai*, the same day may indifferently be called *Saturday* or *Sunday*, according as from *Jerusalem* you reckon *Westward* or *Eastward*. Which is enough for the purpose to which I allege it.

From what hath been said, I think it is very plain, That since, according to your own Scheme. (any where but at *Jerusalem*;) the same day may be indifferently called *Sunday* or *Saturday* (the *first* or the *seventh* day) according as to that place we reckon from *Jerusalem* Eastward or Westward: I am still of opinion that we should not quarrel upon a circumstance which doth not influence (as you call it *Enq.* pag. 27.) the *lively, fiery, morning and evening Word and Prayer*: for men may be as *dead and formal* on a *Saturday* as on a *Sunday*.

You next fall upon me (*Rep.* p. 2.) to know *what Church* it is I would not disturb; for *we live in an age* (you tell us) *wherein are variety of Churches*. Now this I take to be a captious Question. Would you have me here enter on a Dispute of *Whigg* and *Tory*; of *Conformist* and *Non-conformist*; *Episcopal*, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, *Anabaptist*, *Jews* and *Quakers*? (Pray which Church or Churches of all these is it that you have a spight at, in contradistinction to the Churches of *Christ*, who's *true peace*, you say, *you would not disturb*?) No I shall not be lead aside from the point in hand

hand to any of these disputes, which are nothing to the present purpose. By the *Church* whose peace and practice I would not herein disturb, I mean the *Generality of Christian people amongst whom I live*. For (without disputing what other varieties there may be amongst us) I think we are all agreed, except your self and some few others (not so many, I hope, as to be called the *Church*;) to celebrate the *Lords-day*, not the *Jewish Sabbath*.

I would say the like as to your other excursions (in which you seem to take great pleasure) against *Christmasts, Easter, Whitsuntide*, (and other tides as you call them) *Holy-days, Rome, Purgatory, Mass and Monkeny, Formal Worship, Forms of Worship, the Lords Prayer in Publick, Ceremonies, Tradition, Black Garments*, your thoughts of *Monarchy, Swearing to a point, Abjuring Endeavours*, and other the like excursions; with which I mean not to trouble my self: Because, whatever there be of Good or Bad in any of these, it is nothing to our present purpose of a *Saturday-sabbath*. You are very touchy with me (*Rep.* p. 31, 32.) for but naming the phrase of *Hold-ing-forth*, though (I think) very innocently. (And so, I suppose, will those think, that consult the place, not as you cite it *Rep.* p. 32. but as it is in my *Discourse*, p. 29.) This you call *Bleating*, and *Highly Blamable*. (Whether you take me for a *Sheep*, or a *Calf*, I cannot tell.) But, pray Sir, are the Words and Phrases of *Non-Conformists*, so sacred, that a man may not venture to *Name* one of them, without a Reprimand? While you take the liberty to be always Flurting at the Words, Phrases, and Practices of others, when it is nothing to the Purpose. It may prove perhaps that *you have a special Knack at Finding Fault*, but proves nothing to the point in hand. You would not take it kindly of me, if I should upon all occasions (or without occasion) be still inveighing against *Schism, Separation, Non-conformity*, and *Judaizing* (with many other like Topics) or charge you (by insinuation) with *worshiping Saturn upon Saturday* as oft as you do us with *worshiping the Sun upon Sunday*: (But, to *worship the Sun upon Sunday*, runs so glib upon your tongue, that you must needs be at it again and again, even after I had shew'd you plainly that there is no Foundation for it.) Now if it would not become me (as I think it would not) to be still snarling as I go along, at what is nothing to the purpose; pray consider, whether you or I are most *blamable* in this regard. And, if I have handled you therein more *softly* than perhaps another disputant would have done; you should not *blame* me for it; but rather take it kindly.

These things I mention in the beginning, that I may at once throw off these Extravagances and impertinent Excursions, and

not be concerned to answer them where-ever I meet them. And though you tell me, (*Rep. p. 55.*) *this is a short way of answering*, 'tis the way I think fit to use, as to what is nothing to the purpose. You tell us (*p. 75.*) you *pass by divers expressions in the Doctor's Book*; and so shall I in yours, when they be nothing to our business.

But let us come to the business in hand: Wherein are Two Points in question, very distinct: Though you please to make them but One.

First, Whether we have sufficient ground for celebrating the *Lord's-day*, or *First Day of the Week*, as the weeks were then accounted by the Jews, or be now by us.

Secondly, Whether we are also obliged to keep the *Jewish Sabbath* on *their Seventh day*.

The first of these I think was not at all questioned in the Apostles time, but practised generally by all Christians: For it being admitted that the Apostles had Authority and Direction from Christ, for ordering the affairs of the Christian Church, they had no more reason to except against this, than against the introducing of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the institution of Elders, Deacons, Bishops, and of whatever other Officers and Orders in the Church. And therefore of this we meet with no disputes, but a silent Practice. Whether you will allow it the name of *Sabbath* or not, is but to dispute about Words. If you do not like that Name, I allow you to call it *the Lord's Day* as they did. I take it to be a *Sabbath* within the prospect of the *Fourth Commandment*; though, for distinction sake from that of the Jews, they gave it another Name. And I find you sometimes to give the name of *Sabbath* to days which I do not find so called in Scripture.

About the Other, the case was much the same as that of Circumcision, the Pass-over, and other Jewish Feasts or Festivals, the Abstinence from Meats, their Rites of Purification, and the like, which had once been Laws. Of which those who were *Zealous of the Law* were very fond, and loth to part with them. And those of them who thought themselves obliged to be *Baptized and Circumcised also*; did no doubt think themselves obliged, beside the Christians *Lord's-day*, to observe also the *Jewish Sabbath*. This I take to be the true State of the Question then; and this is that which you would now revive.

Concerning the latter, the Apostle adviseth a mutual Forbearance, allowing each to practise according to their own sentiments, without censuring of others, till with time and leisure they should be better satisfied of their Christian Liberty: And did himself comply with them therein; as things *Tolerable*, though not *Obliging*.

ging. With the *Jews*, I mean; to whom these had once been Laws; but would not have them introduced on the Gentiles (as a new Yoke) to whom they had not been Laws before. Of which great distinction I do not find that you take any notice, though I had minded you of it, *Disc. p. 52, 53, 54*, and elsewhere. And we find great weight laid upon this distinction, *Act. 21. 18, 20, 21*. Where *James and the Elders at Jerusalem* do advise *Paul*, though the *Apostle of the Gentiles*, yet (because he was a *Jew*) so far to comply with the *Jews* as to own the lawfulness of their practising, what they did not think fit for the *Gentiles* to do; clearly distinguishing between the *Gentiles*, and the *Jews among the Gentiles*. Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of the *Jews* there are which believe, but yet are all *Zealous of the Law*: And they are informed of thee that thou teachest all the *Jews* that are among the *Gentiles* to forsake *Moses*, saying, that they ought not to circumcise their Children, neither to walk after the Customes, ver. 20, 21. Which was true as to the *Gentiles*, but not as to the *Jews among the Gentiles*. For taking off which prejudice, they advise him to take to him four men who had a Vow, and purify himself with them; to satisfy the *Jews* that he had been misrepresented, and that himself (a *Jew*) walked orderly and kept the Law, ver. 23, 24. But, as touching the *Gentiles* which believe, we have written (say they) and concluded, that they observe no such thing, save onely that they keep themselves from things offered to Idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication, ver. 25. But nothing of the *Jewish Sabbath* (in contradistinction to the *Lord's Day*:) Which I take to be particularly intended by the word *Sabbath*, Col. 2. 16.

Of these Two Questions I shall speak distinctly; and first, *That we have sufficient ground for Celebrating the Lord's Day*.

To this, your great Objection is, that there is no *Express Command, Recorded in Scripture*, for so doing.

In Answer to this I shew'd first, that an *Express Command Recorded*, is not necessary for our Warrant: And then, that there is otherwise in the Word of God sufficient to warrant us therein.

In order to the first, I gave you divers Instances (*Disc. p. 16, 17.*) which I do not remember that you give any Answer. God was worshiped by *Sacrifices* very early; at least as early as that of *Cain and Abel*: And though (I suppose) you think they had some Command for it, yet we have no such *Command Recorded*, antecedent hereunto. The like of *Jacob's* consecrating a *Pillar*, by pouring oil upon it, without any antecedent *Command Recorded* for consecrating either Things or Persons by *Anointing*, or pouring on of Oil.

There was (I presume) a Command (or somewhat equivalent thereunto) that *Fire for Incense* should be taken from the *Altar* (else *Nadab* and *Abihu* would not have been destroyed for offering strange fire.) But I do not find such *Express Command Recorded*. (With other the like Instances, which I forbear to repeat.) To which let me now add the distinction of *Clean and Unclean Beasts and Fowls before the Flood*. *Gen. 7. 2. Gen. 8. 20.* Which was then observed, and by God approved, (as appears by his sending Those by *Sevens*, and These by *Two's*.) and we have reason to think, it was by his order. Yet is no antecedent *Command Recorded* for such distinction that I find. And accordingly I do not doubt but that the Apostles had sufficient authority and direction from Christ (who gave them *Commandments, of things pertaining to the kingdom of God*, *Act. 1. 2, 3.*) for what they settled in the Christian Church, though the particular *Commands* be not *Recorded*. I do not find any particular *Commands* from Christ for their appointing the *seven Deacons* *Act. 6.* for their ordaining *Elders in every Church* *Act. 14. 23.* for giving the like in charge to *Timothy*, to ordain *Bishops and Deacons at Ephesus*, *1 Tim. 3.* and the like to *Titus in Crete*, to ordain *Elders in every City* *Tit. 1.* But because they did these things, we presume they had sufficient warrant, though we have no *express Command recorded* for their so doing.

I add further: You suppose (I presume) that there is a sufficient *Warrant* for a *Weekly Sabbath* from *Gen. 2. 2, 3.* yet there is no *express Command* for it. 'Tis said that *God Rested* (that is, he ceased to create,) but 'tis not said that *Man rested*, or that he was *Bid to rest*. 'Tis said *God blessed the Seventh-day and sanctified it*. (What these words may imply, I need not here dispute.) But 'tis not said that *Man did sanctify or keep it holy*, or was *bid so to do*. *God rested the seventh day*; but he did no more repeat the *seventh day of Rest*, than the *six days of Creation*. And if *Man did sanctify or keep holy that one day*, it is not said that he *did or was bid to keep holy every seventh day to the Worlds end*; and that it must be just that *seventh day* (in a continued circulation of Weeks from the Creation) and *no other*; and that he must *begin every such day just at the same time of the day as God did his Seventh day*; or just at the same time of the day as it was in *Paradise* (at that moment when God ceased to work) though at the same moment it were all hours of the day in some place or other. And if you would have us think (because you think so) that *all this is there implied*; yet certainly this is much short of an *express Command recorded*, for *All this* I say for *All this*. For such were my words *Disc. p. 4.* It is no

*expressly said*, that *All mankind must, for ever after, observe Every Seventh-day in Every Week of Days, reckoned continually from the first Creation*, which, when you cite part of my words *Repl. p. 6.* you thought fit to omit. Yet *All this* must be shewed to be *expressly commanded* (according to your notion) or else somewhat less than an *express Command Recorded*, may serve to justify our *Practice*, and intimate *God's Pleasure*. Less therefore than an *Express Command Recorded* may serve to intimate *God's Pleasure*, and Warrant our *Practice* as to the Lord's Day.

In the next place, let us see what may be alleged in the present case, to warrant our celebration of the *Lord's-day*.

That the *Resurrection* of Christ, which doth accomplish the work of our Redemption (as *Rom. 8. 34.* *Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again*; *Who died for our sins and rose again for our justification*, *Rom. 4. 25.*) is a mercy doubtless that is worth remembering, and therefore not improper for a solemn Commemoration, if at least we have any *incouragement* from *Christ* or the *Apostles practice* for so doing; since great part of the Christian Institution is founded on the Apostles practice, and that of the Primitive Church.

We find that Christ himself, on the day of his *Resurrection*, the *First day of the Week*, or the *first day after the (Jews) Sabbath*, did first appear to the good *Women* who sought him at the Sepulcher, declaring to them the *Resurrection* (which was to preach to them a new Doctrine of which before they were not aware,) and bid them tell it to the Disciples; which they did, and thereupon *Peter and John* (from the rest) went to the Sepulcher and found it so: Which no doubt put them upon serious thoughts, waiting what the issue of this might be. He then joins in company with two Disciples going to *Emmaus*, (whether two of the Twelve, we know not; nor is it very material,) finds them engaged in Religious discourse; and preaches to them (from *Moses and the Prophets*) the things concerning himself; stays with them at *Emmaus*, continuing the same discourse, and was known to them by breaking of bread (celebrating the Lords Supper,) all which are Religious employments, proper for the Celebration of such a day. He then comes to the Disciples at *Jerusalem*, preaches to them the same Doctrine, gives them his *Blessing* (a first and a second time;) blames their *unbelief*, confirms their *Faith*, renews the promise of sending the *Holy Ghost*; gives them *Commission* for preaching the Gospel, and planting the Christian Church; with power of *Miracles* for confirmation of their Doctrine: As I shewed at large (*Disc. p. 17, 18, 19, 20.*) from *Luk. 24. Joh. 20. Mar. 16.* All which put together looks very like the Celebration.

bration (if not the Consecration) of a *Christian Sabbath*, or *Day of Religious Worship*. 'Tis all *Sabbatical work*, and a great deal of it. And we have reason to think (though it be not expressly said so) that he then gave them order to continue the like for the future.

This matter of fact you cannot deny; but do expressly grant it, *Rep. p. 19, 20, 21.* and that all this was *Religious Employment*, fit exercise for such an occasion. Your little Exceptions were most of them answered before. But because you repeat them, I must repeat the Answers. You say, From *Jerusalem to Emmaus* and back again, was more than a *Sabbath days journey*, yet Christ doth not reprove the two Disciples for so traveling. True, (at least so far as we know.) Nor was there any reason for it. For they did not know when they began their journey, what Christ might do before the day was over. I might tell you also (as here you speak) That he did not reprove them, *is not written*. You say, *That Christ did travel without pain, is not written*. True. Nor is it material to me whether he did or did not. (I do rather think, that, after his Resurrection, he was not subject to Bodily Weariness.) But he was *Preaching* all the while (and then, whether sitting or walking is much one.) I hope you do not think it a *breach of the Sabbath* for a man to take pains in *Preaching*. You say, The Disciples being assembled at *Jerusalem* was *Providential*. True. The Providence of God so ordered it that they should be there assembled: But doth it thence follow that they were not *religiously employed*? You say, *You do not know (because it is not written) what they were then employed about, unless mourning and weeping* *Mar. 16. 10.* Do you know how *Adam* was employed (all the day) on the Seventh day from the Creation? That is no more written than this. You own they were employed in *mourning and weeping*. Very well: and was not *mourning and weeping*, at that time, a seasonable employment? You do not know but that, with their mourning and weeping, they might add *Prayer* also and *religious Discourse*, and *serious Consultation* what they were to do in these circumstances, and *waiting on God for direction* therein. Sure I am, you do not know (nor is it written) that they were employed about any *servile work*. Part of the time they were (we know) *Religiously employed*, and you do not know but that they were so all the day. You would have it supposed *Rep. p. 33.* that *Paul's preaching in the Synagogue* did comprehend his conscientious observing the whole Sabbath day (though it be not written) and why may we not as well suppose, the disciples here were well employed all the day? But you say *Christ appeared to the Eleven as they sat at Meat; it was as they sat at Meat*. Very well. But do you think they might not

not *Eat* on a Sabbath-day? Was it a *breach of the Sabbath* to *Eat*? Christ's saying to them *Peace be unto you* was (you tell us) an ordinary salutation, frequent in scripture. But, when Christ said it, was it not a *Blessing* also? When *Man* says, *Peace be unto you*, it is a *Prayer*; but when *God* says it, 'tis more than so, it is an *Authoritative Benediction*. And when he said it again a second time, (*Jesus said to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you: And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted &c. Job. 20. 21, 22, 23.*) was all this but an Ordinary Salutation? But suppose the Disciples (not yet knowing, before Christ came to them, that he would appoint the day to be so observed) had on some part of the day done some ordinary business that we know not of, was this any fault in them? Or doth it thence follow that it was not for the future (when they should know it) to be *religiously observed*? Doth any thing appear, after Christ came to them, but what was *highly Religious*? But, that this doth alter the Seventh or appoint the First day for a Sabbath (you say) you do not find. Stay a while, we are not yet upon that point, *What is to become of the Seventh day*, or whether the First is to be called a Sabbath. (We shall come to that anon.) We are yet inquiring Whether there be not from hence encouragement for a *Religious Observation* of this day. We do not read (you say) the Lord blamed the Disciples for resting on the Sabbath-day; (meaning, the Jews Sabbath then past.) Very True. Nor was there any occasion for it. For the Sabbath-day was past before the Resurrection: And 'tis not pretended that, before the Resurrection, (the Memorial thereof) the First day was appointed. But neither do we Read, that they did so Rest, you do but think so.

From what hath been said, we see that Our Lord Jesus Christ, and his Disciples with him, did celebrate the day of the Resurrection, by *Religious Employments*. Which is one good Precedent; and somewhat more than what you shew us of the Seventh day Sabbath from *Gen. 2. 2, 3.* That God did rest the Seventh day, we there Read, or, as you please to phrase it, that our Lord Jesus Christ did so rest; but, that Man did so rest (or was bid so to do) we do not Read. You can but conjecture it (as you speak) or collect it by Argument. We come now to a second Precedent. That God did once rest on the Seventh day, we read. But that he did repeat his Seventh-day rest, we no more read, than that he repeated the six days of Creation. But our Lord Jesus Christ did a second time so meet with his Disciples so assembled, and was in a like manner employed. After  
eigh.

eight days Christ appeared to the Disciples, and Thomas with them. *Joh. 20. 26.* He then satisfied Thomas (who was before absent) as well as the rest concerning the Resurrection, and much in the same manner as before, but with somewhat more particular. That he did so meet, with the Disciples then assembled, you do not deny; nor, that they were so employed. But you do not admit that after eight days doth signify the eighth day after taken inclusively. (And why not? But because then it would be on the first day of the week as the other was?) And you are offended that I should take this to be a Cavil. After eight days, you say, may be the ninth or tenth day (yes, or the twentieth, or a year after, for all this is after eight days,) and you can so count it upon your fingers (*Enquiry, p. 50, 51.*) But you know also, that it is the usual way in Scripture (and other where) thus to reckon inclusively. I gave you several instances to that purpose, of which I shall repeat some. *Mat. 27. 63.* they tell Pilate, This deceiver said, After three days I will rise again, (*ver. 64. & 65. & 66.*) meaning thereby the third day after inclusively; and therefore they pray that the Sepulchre might be made sure till the third day. They should have said (according to your reckoning) on the fourth day and so forward; for to what purpose would it be to secure it till the third day and no more, if the Pretense of Rising were not till after the third day is past. Here, you confess (*Rep. p. 23.*) that, by after three days must needs be meant, till after the third day is come; not, till after the third day is past; and so his enemies understand it.

So *Mar. 8. 31.* The Son of Man must be killed, and After three days rise again; that is, on the third day inclusively. And here also you own (*Rep. p. 23.*) that it must be so understood; The Crucifixion (you say) was on the sixth day, and the Resurrection on the first day of the next week; and therefore, by After three days, is meant After part of the sixth day, the whole Seventh day, and part of the First day. You own therefore that in these places after three days must needs be the same as on the third day. And why not as well after eight days the same as on the eighth day.

After eight days, you say, is nowhere explained to be the Eighth day. What subtlety there may be in the words is nowhere explained. I cannot tell: But doth it no where so signify? What say you to that *Luk. 2. 21.* When Eight days were Accomplished (for the Circumcision of the Child) they called his name of Jesus? 'tis all one to say When eight days were accomplished as to say After eight days he came? And this also you own (*Rep. p. 24.*) must be so understood. Now, If after three days signify no more but after the third day came: why should we not think that after eight days doth as well

signify after the eighth day was come; that is, as we use to speak in English, on that day se'n-night. Sure we are, it was not on the Jewish Sabbath (for it was, to that, but Seven days, not after Eight days.)

'Tis manifest therefore that our Saviour made choice of another day than the Jewish Sabbath, for these Sabbatical Works: And I think it is plain to be the first day of the week.

I'll give you one text more, (which I did not name before, because I would not trouble you to compute it,) *Act. 24. 1.* After five days, Ananias the High-Priest descended with the Elders and with a certain Orator named Tertullus who informed the Governour against Paul. After five days, that is, on the fifth day (after Paul's being apprehended.) How doth that appear, (you will ask) since it is nowhere explained, that this after five days is on the fifth day? I'll shew you presently. Paul comes to Jerusalem, *Act. 21. 17.* that was one day. The day following 'tis said Paul went in with us unto James, and all the Elders were present, ver. 18. Who then advise him thus, We have four men which have a Vow on them; take them and purify thy self with them, &c. ver. 23, 24. that's a Second day. Then Paul took the men and the next day (there's a Third day) purifying himself with them, entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of Purification, ver. 26. (which we find to be the space of seven days, *Num. 6. 13.* inclusively from that Third day; which were therefore to end on the Ninth day.) But when the seven days were almost ended, ver. 27. not, when the last of those seven were almost ended (for we have not days enough for that) but, the seventh day was almost come (for when that day was come, the seven days were accomplished, according to that *Luk. 2. 21.*) that is, on the sixth day of those seven, which was the Eighth day from his coming to Jerusalem. On this Eighth day the Jews laid hands on him, ver. 27. and when they were about to kill him, the chief Captain rescued him and carried him into the Castle, ver. 31, 34. On the morrow (which was the Ninth day) he was brought down before the Counsel, Chap. 22. 30. where he made his defense, Chap. 23. 1. and was brought back to the Castle, ver. 10. That night the Lord stood by him to comfort him, ver. 11. ('tis said that night, the night of that ninth day, not on the morrow night, as if it were the night of the tenth day.) and when it was day (that is on the Tenth day) more than fourty of the Jews banded together to kill him, ver. 12, 13. of which conspiracy when Paul's kinsman had informed the chief Captain, ver. 16, 20, 21. he sent him that night (the night of the tenth day,) with a guard, to Antipatris ver. 23, 31. from whence on the morrow (which was the Eleventh day) he came to Cesarea ver. 32, 33. (which Eleventh day

is the *morrow after*, the *third hour of the night* foregoing, not the *same day* with it.) When they came to *Cesarea*, *Felix* commanded him to be kept in *Herods Judgment-hall*, till his *Accusers* should come, ver. 35. (which was on the next day.) And after five days, Chap. 24. 1. (not, from the *Eleventh* on which he was brought to *Cesarea*, but from the *Eighth* on which he was seized in the Temple) the *High Priest* and *Elders*, with *Tertullus* a *Lawyer*, came down to inform against him. Now, if after five days be meant of the fifth day (from that Eighth) inclusively (taking that Eighth day for the first of the five) this will be on the *Twelfth day*; if on the fifth day after (exclusive of that eighth day) it will be on the *Thirteenth*; if after five whole days (beside that eighth) were past, it must be the *Fourteenth* from his first coming to *Jerusalem*. And which of the three it was, *Paul* tells us at ver. 11. *Thou mayst understand* (saith he to the Governour) *that there are yet but Twelve days since I went up to Jerusalem for to worship*. So that after five days must be meant of the fifth day current, inclusively; otherwise it would have been thirteen or fourteen days from his coming to *Jerusalem* to worship. Now if *St. Luke*, by *when eight days were accomplished* do mean the eighth day current Luk. 2. 21. and the same *St. Luke* by *after five days* do mean the fifth day current (inclusively) Act. 24. 1. And *S. Mathew* (Chap. 27. 3.) and *S. Mark* (Chap. 8. 31.) by *after three days* do mean the third day inclusively, why should not *S. John* (Chap. 20. 26.) be thought to speak the same language, by *after eight days* meaning the eighth day inclusively. Especially, when there is no appearance of reason to the contrary, save that it doth not favour your *Fansy*.

And *Levit. 23. 15, 16.* *Ye shall count unto you, from the morrow after the Sabbath (from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering) seven Sabbaths shall be compleat; even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days.* Which cannot be, unless the first and last day be taken into that number, inclusively. And if these (with what I said before) be not enough, you may find many more if you please to search.

A like reckoning we have, concerning *Cornelius*, Act. 10. *Cornelius saw a Vision about the Ninth hour of the day*, ver. 3. (that's one day.) When the Vision was ended, he presently sent two servants and a souldier for *Peter*, ver. 7, 8. as he was directed. On the morrow (that's a second day) *Peter* went up to pray about the sixth hour, and saw a Vision likewise, ver. 9. &c. Which being ended, the men who were sent from *Cornelius*, were (by that time) come, and enquired for him, ver. 17, 18. He went down to them, called them in, and lodged them that night, ver. 21, 23. On the morrow (that's a third

third day) he went with them from *Joppa* ver. 23. On the morrow after (that's a fourth day) they entered into *Cesarea*, where *Cornelius* waited for them, (ver. 24.) who tells him (ver. 30.) *Four days ago I was fasting &c.* (relating the cause why he sent for *Peter*.) Now if that (before this) was four days ago, this (after that) must be four days after; which was (as is manifest) the fourth day, inclusively.

You may see more to this purpose in my *Discourse* p. 20, 21, 22. which I do not repeat, because you seem to think (*Rep. p. 22.*) there is too much already.

You have never heard, you say, much less do We commonly so speak; that after eight days, is that day se'night: I suppose you lay the Emphasis on *We*; that is, *We in England* do not commonly so speak. But, you know, in other languages (and, I think, in all other) they do so speak. I need not tell you that, What we call a *Se'night*, a *Fortnight*, the French call *huit jours*, *quinze jours*, that is, *Eight days*, *Fifteen days*. Nor need I tell you that *S. Luke* did not speak *English*, nor did he live in *England*.

But, after all this fencing (I must not call it *shifting*) do you indeed think that after eight days, in this place, is not meant of the same day in the next week? And do you so think (as you phrase it) without doubt or scruple? You say (*Rep. p. 22*) you do not discern but that it may be (the second or third day of the next week) but do you think *It is so*? Consider of it. And if what I say now be not enough, look over also what I said before.

And you do not produce any place where this form of Speech is otherwise to be understood. Onely two places you mention, where you think possibly it may be. Which I shall consider. *Mat. 26. 2.* *Ye know that after two days is the Passover, and the Son of Man is betrayed to be Crucified:* seems to be meant (you say *Rep. p. 22.*) after two days exclusively, that is, excluding the day on which that was said. If you think so, I cannot help it. Nor can you help it if I think otherwise. I take it to be thus, After two days, or there are but two days (to day and to morrow) when (at evening) I shall eat the Passover, and shall be betrayed to be crucified. And ver. 2. while (in the mean time) the chief Priests &c. (we are told ver. 3, 4, 5.) were assembled, consulting how they might take *Jesus* by subtlety and kill him. After which follows presently, ver. 6. *Now when Jesus was in Bethany, (viz. the same day) there came a Woman (viz. Mary the Sister of Lazarus, Joh. 11. 2.) with an Alabaster Box of Ointment, and poured it on his head, ver. 7. Which when the disciples saw it, they (that is, one of them, meaning Judas Iscariot, Joh. 12. 5.) said, wherefore is this wast, it might have been sold and given to the poor &c. ver. 8, 9.*

(not that he cared for the poor, but because he had the bag. Joh. 12. 6.) To whom when Jesus had given an unpleasing answer, *The poor you have always with you, &c.* ver. 10, 11, 12, 13. then Judas went unto the high Priests, and agreed to betray him, ver. 14, 15, 16. Now the first day of unleavened bread (the latter of those two days) the disciples came unto Jesus saying, where wilt thou that we prepare the Pass-over &c. ver. 17, 18, 19. Now when Even was come, he sat down with the Twelve &c. ver. 20. And the same night (being the latter of the two days mentioned ver. 2.) he was betrayed by Judas; as follows in the Chapter. The words *After two days* being taken inclusively.

A like Answer may serve for your other Instance (for you have but two) concerning the *Two Witnesses* Rev. 11. 11. *After three days and an half the spirit entered into them, and they stood upon their feet &c.* that is, *After three days and an half were come*; (not after three days and an half were past,) as it is every where else. Nor do you give us one instance to the contrary, where it must be otherwise understood. And yet I must not call this *trifling*, or say that *I am sorry to see it*. For you yet insist upon it Rep. p. 22. that it is not so weak as the Doctor represents it.

But, you say further, Rep. p. 24. *If after eight days did here include the first of the eight, and exclude the day after the eighth*, (as doubtless it doth;) *Yet here is no abrogating the Seventh-day-Sabbath, nor instituting the First*. This you should have said at first, (without quareling at after eight days.) But we are not now inquiring What is to become of the *Seventh-day*, or Whether the *First* shall be called a Sabbath; But, whether here be not a *second Precedent* for celebrating the first day. And these *Two Precedents*, in the *Two First Weeks* from the Resurrection, are Precedents of Christ himself with his Disciples; and a good Pattern for them and us to follow. On how many more first-days he did so appear to them, we know not: We do not read that he did, nor do we read that he did not.

The next Precedent is that of Pentecost. (Disc. p. 37, 38.) Christ on the day of the Resurrection (the first day of the week) had Renewed his promise of sending the Holy Ghost (Luk. 24. 43.) and on the day of Pentecost (the first day of the Week also) he Fulfilled this promise, Act. 2. in a miraculous manner. *They were all with one accord in one place*, ver. 1. (they were unanimously assembled as on a solemn occasion,) when the Holy Ghost fell upon them in the similitude of Cloven Tongues, ver. 2, 3, 4. And Peter preached to a great Congregation (of Parthians, Medes, Elamites, &c. ver. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.) upon that occasion, ver. 14. &c. and with so good suc-

cess,

cess, as that the same day were added to them about three thousand souls, ver. 41. Now that here was a very solemn Religious Assembly on the day of Pentecost, attended with such Miraculous Success, you do not deny; But will not allow it to be the first day of the week; Rep. p. 36. You know (you say) no Word for that, nor other ground but Conjectures, and some Romish Traditions in the case? I thought I had proved it very plainly Disc. p. 37, 38. (not out of the Romans, but) from Levit. 23. (of which you please to take no notice.) The Wave-offering was to be the morrow after the Sabbath ver. 11. and ye shall count to you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the Wave-offering, seven Sabbaths shall be compleat, even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and then was to be the feast of weeks or Pentecost: And is not the morrow after their Sabbath, the first day of their week? Which proof is so clear, that you thought best to say nothing of it, but rather to talk of Romish Traditions. If the word Pentecost displease you (that is, the fiftieth day,) instead of what is called the feast of Weeks, Deut. 16. 9, 10; I had it not from any Romish Tradition, but from Act. 2. 1. and 1 Cor. 16. 8.

Now if I were as fond to stretch (for an Institution) as sometimes you seem to be; how fair an opportunity is there from hence to urge, that, beside the weekly Sabbath on the Seventh day, God hath here appointed the feast of Pentecost, on the morrow after the Sabbath, which feast of Pentecost was to be a Sabbath also (no servile work to be done thereon, Levit. 23. 1. and your self call it a Sabbath, Rep. p. 48.) as if it had been designed as a type or fore-runner of the Christian Sabbath to succeed on the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath. I might urge the same from the Wave-offering, ver. 10, 11, which was also to be the morrow after the Sabbath, ver. 11. and 'tis called the feast of first fruits; *Ye shall bring a Sheaf of the First Fruits of your harvest*, ver. 10. before which first fruits so brought, they were not to eat any thing of the harvest, neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, ver. 14. And with allusion to this Feast of first fruits (on the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath) Christ (rising on the first day of the week) is said to be risen from the dead, the first fruits of them that slept, 1 Cor. 15. 20. and again ver. 23. Christ the first fruits, afterward those that are Christ; which first fruits, both in the Type, and in the Anti-type, was to be the morrow after the Seventh-day-Sabbath; and it self a kind of Sabbath also, a holy Convocation, on which no servile work shall be done. Which two Feasts (of the First-fruits and Pentecost) seem to be the fore-runners of another Sabbath to be on the morrow after the Seventh-day-Sabbath.

But

But you tell us *Rep. p. 36.* You think you can prove by the Word that *Pentecost* was on the *Seventh-day-sabbath*, and not upon the first day of the Week. By what Word? certainly not by the Word of God; For that says expressly the *morrow after the Seventh Sabbath* *Lev. 23. 11.* You say, *Christ kept the Pass-over on one day and the Jews on another.* What then? On whatever day Christ kept the Pass-over, this doth not make the *morrow after the Sabbath* not to be the first day of the Week. You do not certainly know (you say) what was the *Fiftieth day from the true day on which Christ and his disciples kept the Pass-over.* Nor is it any thing to the purpose if you did know it. 'Tis your great mistake here (and again *p. 48.*) to think the *fifty days* are to be reckoned from the day of the Pass-over: they are to be reckoned from the day of the Wave-offering, the *morrow after the Sabbath* (on which was to be the Wave-offering) and fifty days from thence is expressly called the *morrow after the seventh Sabbath.* A like mistake it is when you take the Month *Nisan* to be the first New-Moon after the Vernal Equinox, *Eng. p. 121.* and that the Month or Moon *Nisan* began after the Vernal Equinox, *p. 122.* For the Month *Nisan* or *Abib*, was that whose Full-Moon was next after the Vernal Equinox (or which was reputed so to be) though its New-Moon was oft before it, and might be fourteen days before. The fourteenth day might be before the Equinox, if but the Fifteenth day (the day of the Full-Moon, and first day of the Feast) were on or after the Equinox: or at least, by the Priest reputed so to be. But what you suggest as doubtful, *p. 122.* whether the fourteenth day was not reckoned from the day of the Equinox, is yet more extravagant. For how can the fourteenth day of the Month be the Fourteenth day from the Equinox, unless we would fancy the day of the Equinox to be always New-Moon. But this doth not concern our controversy.

And this confidence (of proving it by the Word to be the *Seventh-day-sabbath* when the Word says expressly it is the *morrow after the Sabbath*) is like what you tell us *Eng. p. 43.* and do again insist upon it, *Rep. p. 35, 36.* of *Christ's Ascension on the Sabbath-day*; (and the day of Judgment likewise.) When yet in the same Chapter the time of Christ's abode with them after his Resurrection is expressly said to be *forty days*, *Act. 1. 3.* (of which the day of his Resurrection was the First, and the day of his Ascension was the Last;) And, if the first of these Forty were (as is confessed) the first day of the week, how is it possible that the last of the Forty can be the Seventh-day? But see how far Fancy can carry a man, when it works strongly!

But because you do yet insist upon it (*Rep. p. 35, 36.*) that *Christ's Ascension may be on a Sabbath-day*; notwithstanding so clear a proof from

from Scripture, that it was the last of forty days, whereof the first was Sunday, and therefore the last must needs be Thursday, not Saturday; as I had shewed *Disc. p. 35.* in Answer to your *Eng. p. 43.* I will consider once more what you bring for proof of it.

Two things you offer by way of Argument, First, that it is said *Mount Olivet* (from whence Christ ascended) is said to be about a Sabbath days journey from Jerusalem; and therefore on a Sabbath-day. And then, that Christ and his disciples were then assembled and Christ preached; therefore on a Sabbath-day. Which I shall consider distinctly.

As to the first, You tell us *Rep. p. 35.* that a Sabbath-day's journey was of old esteemed about two miles; (how old, you do not tell us;) now what's this but Tradition? And 'tis agreed, you take it, by Geographers, that *Mount Olivet* is about two Miles from Jerusalem. Admit it be so, what then? The Cities of the Levites (you say) were to reach two thousand Cubits from without the City, *Numb. 35. 5.* This, I doubt, is a mistake, for it is, ver. 4. the Suburbs of the Cities which you shall give to the Levites shall reach from the Wall of the City and outward, a thousand (not two thousand) cubits round about. So that from without the City was but one thousand Cubits; but from the middle was to be two thousand, as at ver. 5. Ye shall measure from without the City; (that is, inward from the utmost bounds to the middle of the City; for so the words are (*michuts lagnir*) from without to the City,) on the East-side two thousand Cubits, and on the South side two thousand Cubits, and on the West-side two thousand Cubits, and on the North-side two thousand Cubits, and the City shall be in the midst; this shall be to them the Suburbs of the City; that is, the utmost compass of the Suburbs, in the midst whereof is the City. But in ver. 4. the City is not measured, but from the walls of the City outward; for so the words are (*mikkir bagnar va-chutsa*) from the Wall of the City outward: So that from the utmost bounds to the wall was one thousand Cubits, and from thence to the Middle was another thousand Cubits; and therefore the length or breadth of the City from Wall to Wall, two thousand Cubits; (not two Miles.) and from the utmost bounds of the Suburbs, to the midst of the City, was two thousand Cubits: And, if you mean thus, we are as to this point agreed. You tell us also that in *Josh. 3. 3, 4.* when the Ark was born toward Jordan, the people were to go after it, yet there was to be a space between them and it, about two thousand Cubits by measure, they were not to come nearer to it. Admit this also. What then? Is it any where in Scripture said that two thousand Cubits is a Sabbath-days journey? Now what those Cubits in mea-

measure did extend to, the Jews, you say, could best tell us, (perhaps better than You or I) but what then? *Who thought it* (you say) *about two Miles.* What's this but *Jewish Tradition*? if they did so. But pray tell me, Which of all their Rabbins tells you that *two thousand cubits*, are *two miles*? Mr. Ainsworth in his Annotations on *Exod. 16. 29.* (from whence I suppose you borrow most of this) who was acquainted with the Jews and the Jewish measures better than so, makes it not above *one mile*; *An Italian or English Mile*: (and 'tis indeed not so much :) why do you make it *twice so much*? A Mile (*mille passus*) is a *thousand paces*, and *two mile*, is *two thousand paces*. Can you think a *thousand cubits* are as much as a *thousand paces*? No, nor half so much. For a *cubit* is but about *half a yard*, that is *one foot and a half*, or *eighteen inches*; and a *pace* is *five foot*. You are out in your *Measures* therefore as well as in your *Numbers*.

It had been shorter work (if you had a mind to let us know what you think to be the length of a Sabbath-days journey) to have said in brief, *'Tis agreed by Geographers that Mount Olivet is from Jerusalem about two miles, which is here called a Sabbath-days journey; and therefore a Sabbath-days journey, is about two miles.* Which had been plain and easy, without troubling your self or us (as you speak) with *dark conjectures and some uncertain* (not *Romish*, but) *Jewish Traditions*, which you can make nothing of. Those (Rabbins) who think a Sabbath-days journey to be *two thousand cubits*, do not think it to be *two miles*; and those who think it to be *two Miles*, think it to be *much more than two thousand cubits* (for these measures are inconsistent,) nor do I know that any man before you, did think a *cubit* to be *five foot*.

But, be it more or less, the length of a Sabbath-days journey is nothing to our purpose: The text says, *Then they* (the disciples) *returned to Jerusalem, from the Mount called Olivet,* ὁ ὄρος ἑλαιῶν Ἰερουσαλὴμ, *which was near to Jerusalem* (and therefore it was not far to go) but how near? οὐκ ἔστιν ἔξω ἱερὺς containing a Sabbath-days journey. But what then? If a Sabbath-days journey were then the known name of a Jewish measure, was it not as near on a *Thursday*, as on a *Saturday*? 'Twas near, he tells you, and how near; but he doth not tell you on what day. Nor need he; for when he had before signified that it was the *fourtieth day* from the *Resurrection*, which was on *Sunday* (the first day of the week) we might know (without telling) that the *fourtieth day* must needs be *Thursday*, (the fifth day of the week) not on *Saturday*, the Sabbath day. But because the distance is here designed by the length of a Sabbath-days journey (a known length, it seems, amongst the Jews) you fancy it must needs

needs be on the Sabbath day, (as if it were not the same length every day in the week :) And this fancy, must bear down so clear a proof, that it could be no other than *Thursday*, the fifth day of the week, as being the *last* of *fourty*, whereof the *first* was *Sunday*. It seems rather to me, that it was to satisfy posterity, who would be inquisitive When and Where so considerable a thing happened as was our Saviour *Ascension*, and whereabouts that place lay: So he tells them, it was the *Fourtieth day* from his *Resurrection on the first day of the week*, it was from a place called *Mount Olivet*, which was near to *Jerusalem*, and no farther from it than a Sabbath-day walk.

Your second Argument, which I promised to consider, was, *That Christ and his Disciples were then assembled, and Christ preached.* Enq. p. 43. Now if you admit this as a good Argument to prove it a Sabbath day; I think it serves our turn better than yours. For, *that Christ and his Disciples were assembled* on the day of the *Resurrection* the first day of the week, is certain, and past dispute: And it is as certain, that he did then preach to them. But how doth it appear that he preached to them on the day of his *Ascension*? It's like enough that he did (on whatever day it happened to be) give them a Farewell Discourse: but it is not here said so. 'Tis said indeed that during the *fourty days* wherein he was seen of them, he had given commandments to the *Apostles*, to whom he had shewed himself alive after his *Passion*, by many infallible proofs speaking to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; and had (when he assembled with them) commanded them to wait at *Jerusalem* till they should receive the *Holy-Ghost*, as he had before promised them, (Acts 1. 2, 3, 4, 5.) which I do acknowledge to be *Preaching*: But on which of the *fourty days* he thus preached, we are not told in this place, (but only that it was during these *fourty days* :) But in *Luke 24. ver. 36.* to the end of *ver. 49.* (and in the parallel places in the other Evangelists) we are told, on what day All this was done, namely, on the day of his *Resurrection*. So that, if this preaching, to them *Assembled*, do prove a Sabbath-day; it proves the first day of the week to be a Sabbath. We find nothing new on the day of his *Ascension*, (Act. 1. 6, 7.) but his answering to that question, *Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?* to which his Answer was, *It is not for you to know the times and seasons, &c.* And I suppose, it is from the clearness of this my Answer, that in your *Reply* p. 35, 36. you think fit to wave this Argument. I am here, only to beg the Reader's pardon, for holding him so long in the Answering of these two Arguments, which did so little need it.

The next Precedent is from *Acts* 20. 7. which, though a single instance, doth fairly intimate an usual practise of so doing. Upon the first day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight. 'Tis here plain, that on the first day of the week there was a Religious Assembly, as appears by their religious exercise therein; and that it was a Christian Assembly, for it was the Disciples were thus assembled, and they were assembled to break bread, a Christian Service; and (as appears by the circumstances) a great Assembly; it was the Disciples (*οἱ μαθηταὶ*) not (*τινὲς*) some of them; and so many as to be mounted up to the third loft, ver. 9. and Paul preached to them a long Sermon, continuing his speech till midnight. Which I take to be a fourth Precedent of celebrating the first day for religious service.

To this you make many exceptions, (that the number of them may supply their want of weight.)

First you except, (*Eng* p. 55.) this is but once, it is but one Fact. (And this One, Once, is repeated more than once, twice, or thrice, *Eng* p. 55, 56. we have it ten times within less than the quantity of one page.) But one such Precedent of celebrating the Seventh day Sabbath, (after God's Resting *Gen*. 2. 2, 3. and before that of *Exod*. 16.) would do you special service, if you could find it. And this once is so set down as fairly to intimate it was wont so to be. And the first day of the week, when they were come together to break bread, Paul preached, &c. would fairly intimate to a candid Reader, that they then came together to break bread as being the first day of the week; on which they used to come together for that purpose. I had put a case, *Disc* p. 38. (which you have not thought fit to answer,) if you could find in the Book of *Job*, that on the seventh day of the week when *Job* and his friends were assembled for the joyn't service of God, *Bildad* spake thus, &c. whether you would not think it a good proof that the seventh day Sabbath was then wont to be observed? I put the case again for you to consider of.

You then except (if I understand you aright) to the word *Preached*. For so your words are, *Eng* p. 55. In answer to which objection (that is, to our Argument from this place) the Reader (you say) may take notice that the Greek word here [*Preached*] is the same word which is rendered [*Reasoned*] *Acts* 17. 2. and *Acts* 18. 4. Which I do not see how it can come in by way of Answer to our Argument otherwise than by extenuating the word *Preached*, as too high a word for this place, the same Greek word (*διελογησατο*) being elsewhere translated *Reasoned*. To which my answer was this

this (*Disc* p. 29.) Be it so; and, if that word will please him better, let it be so here; He Reasoned, Discoursed, Treated, or did Hold forth; (that, I think will not alter the case;) and he Continued or Held-on (*κατένευεν*) this Discourse, this Speech, this Sermon (*ὁν λόγον* Sermonem) till mid-night; he held-on this Holding-forth till mid-night: which I take to be the same thing with what we now call Preaching, or very like it: ('Twas a long continued Discourse, to a Congregation met together upon a Religious account, for the Service of God.) But let it be called (if he please) A Religious Discourse, of the Holy Apostle, to a Congregation of Christians, met together for such a purpose. This is the whole of what I said on this occasion.

But with this you are highly displeased; *Repl* p. 31. He renders (you say) *διελογησατο* Holding-forth; (No. The Dr. renders it Preached; but gives you leave, if you like that word better, to render it Held forth;) and this rendering Holding-forth the Dr. does twice. And p. 32. This (of suggesting Reasoned instead of Preached) the Doctor seems to take offence at: (No; but allows you so to render it) and gives leave to render it Paul did hold forth, (yes, or by any of these other words I mentioned;) and (instead of He continued his speech) that he Held on his Holding-forth till midnight. Which Expression of Holding-forth hath been much abused in this Age by some Men, against Eminently Holy and Learned Non-conforming Ministers; when they have been accused as Male-factors for preaching the Gospel, to scorn, reproach and despise them as Holders-forth, &c. And the Expression of Holding-forth being taken in an ill and despicable sense by some who so use it; I think the Doctor might have spared to put it upon Paul, who in preaching Christ was then a Non-conformist Minister; and it seems, if it were not written incautiously, to be Highly Blamable. In which Expressions of Holding-forth, with others afterwards which refer to Spiritual Praying and Praising, as this does to Preaching the Gospel, (Does the Doctor any where speak against Spiritual Praying, Praising or Preaching?) the Doctor goes in bad Company, and I doubt highly gratifies them while he writes so agreeably to their Language. Which words of the Doctor, however written with some seeming softness, are a very Ill Bleat, if they were meant, which I hope they were not, as they are commonly understood by all Good and Bad Men that I know. And all this but for Naming the word Holding-forth, though with allowance.

Now what need all this? *Tantene animis cœlestibus iræ*? Do not you know, that the Phrase of Holding-forth was taken up by Non-conformists? about the Year 1642 or 1643, as I remember, (at least I do not remember to have heard it sooner: It might

perhaps by the *Dissenting Brethren* be brought with them out of *Holland*) and in contradistinction to the word *Preaching*? and used by them (or some of them) so long and so frequently, till it began to be thought a ridiculous *Affectation*, and did afford matter of Drollery to those that a mind to be pleasant? (And whether or no the word be yet left off, I do not know; though now the word *Speaking* be come in use in the same sense.) It was taken up upon this occasion; when it grew frequent for *Gifted-Brethren* (if I may so call them without offence, as they were wont to call themselves) to speak publicly in their Meetings; they were then shy of calling this *Preaching*, but called it (by a softer name) *Holding-forth*; and 'twas usual to ask, *Who held-forth, to day?* But when they began to be laughed out of this, it was then *Who did speak to day?* Not thinking it fit to call it *Preaching*, when the Speaker was not a Minister or other Church-Officer. And I know no great hurt in the word (saying that it seems a *Needless Affectation*.) For to *Sew-forth*, or *Hold-forth* (*exhibere*) are in themselves no bad Expressions, (and the best words that are may be drolled-upon, or turned into *Ridicule*, by those who have a mind so to do;) and therefore (though I would not choose to use it, yet) if others please so to speak, I can admit it. And, in this place, if you do not like the word *Preaching*, I am content you make use of your own word, or any of those mentioned, or any of a like import: For, what ever you please to call it, this *Discourse* of Paul to a *Christian Congregation*, was at least a *Religious Exercise* on the first day of the week; Which serves the present Argument as well as if you call it *Preaching*. And I thought I had accommodated the matter with such a temper, as might serve both; If you neither like the word *Preaching*, nor *Holding-forth*; Let it be called a *Religious Discourse, of the Holy Apostle, to a Congregation of Christians, met together for such a purpose*. Which I take to be inoffensive words.

But 'tis further aggravated that the *Doctor* does twice so render it. No; but does twice permit you so to use it if you please. And truly if in the first place you render *ἡλίστα* by *held-forth*, it is very proper in the second place to render *ἡλίστα* by *holding-forth*; for *ἡλίστα* is but a Noun from the same Verb *ἡλίστα*. And whether *ἡλίστα* be rendered by *continuing* or *holding-on*, is much one, for they signify both alike: and then I know not what (in this second place) should offend you anew, unless the *paronomasia* (of *holding-on* his *holding-forth*) offend your Ear. And if neither *preaching* nor *holding-forth* do please you, I gave you the choice of a great many other words.

But

But since the Expression of *Holding-forth*, hath been taken in an *Ill* and *Despightful* sense by some, (you do not charge me to be one of those some, and therefore to this I shall make no defense; but onely that, as to this word, I go in ill company,) against *Eminently Holy and Learned Non-conformings Ministers*; you think (p. 32.) I might have spared to put it upon Paul, who was then a *Non-conformist Minister and Preacher*. Did I call Paul a *Non-conformist Preacher*? or is it you who call him so? (I hope you do it not to disparage Paul, but to credit the *Non-conformists*.) Nor does the *Doctor* put it upon Paul. We say Paul preached, 'tis you find fault with that word, without telling us what word you would have instead of it. Which word if you do not like, I give you leave to use your own, or to take your choice of many more.

But must all be right that all our *Non-conformists* say or do? and must none of them be touched for what ever they do or say, because St. Paul, (you say) was a *Non conformist*? May no body speak to the disadvantage of *Jews, Anabaptists, Papists, or Quakers*, (for all these are *Non-conformists*) or so much as name the word *Dipping*, because (you say) Paul was a *Non-conformist*? May we not name *Monkery, Monks and Romish Prelates*, or *Popish Rebelious Subjects and Clergy*, (as Enq. p. 117, 121,) because Paul was a *Non-conformist*? I think 'tis too great a Privilege: and too great an over-weening of your selves to expect or claim it. Surely some *Non conformists* (for there be a great many sorts of them) may be blamed for somewhat they do, notwithstanding Paul's being a *Non-conformist*.

You might have called him a *Conformist* if you pleased, for you tell us He came to the Synagogue, and preached there every Sabbath-day: which you suppose to comprehend and include all the rest that was requisite to the keeping the Sabbath (perfectly as to Christ; and as to the Apostles, in their measure) else we should have read it there objected against them, which we do not find, Rep. p. 33. He bore his head at Cenchrea because he had a Vow, Act. 18. 18. He caused Timothy to be circumcised because his Mother was a Jew, Act. 16. 1. He would by all means keep the Feast at Jerusalem, Act. 18. 21. (which you take to be the Pass-over, Enq. p. 122.) and to that purpose went from Ephesus to Jerusalem, though he were thence to return again. And the like for Pentecost, if possible, Act. 20. 16. And Act. 21. 20, 21, 23, 24, 26. He joins in the Ceremonies of Purification, with four men that had a Vow; and this to vindicate himself from the reproch which was raised upon him (as a *Non-conformist*) that he taught the Jews which were among the Gentiles

D 3

to

to forsake Moses, and that they ought not to circumcise their children, nor to walk after the customs: to confute which calumny, he thus complied, that all might know that those things whereof they were informed concerning him (touching his Non-conformity) were not so, but that himself also walked orderly, and kept the Law. (that is the Ceremonial Law, the Law spoken of ver. 21. they (the Jews) which believe and are all zealous of the Law.) And when he was accused as faulty therein, he stands upon his justification, Chap. 24. 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20. and again Chap. 26. 7, 8, 10, 11. that neither against the Law of the Jews, nor against the Temple, nor against Cesar, had he offended in any thing, nor could they prove the things whereof they accused him: And we find *Lysias, Felix, Festus*, and King *Agrippa* acquitting him, as having done nothing worthy of death or of bonds, Chap. 23. 23. Chap. 24. 22, 23. Chap. 25. 18, 19. Chap. 26. 31. according to what he tells us elsewhere, that to the Jew he became as a Jew, and was as to the Law blameless: Phil. 3. 5, 6. Though yet you own, Enq. p. 123. that, after the death of Christ, he was under no obligation, to keep that Feast of the Pass-over, but was, by his death, delivered from that as well as all other Ceremonies, which are all nailed to his Cross. Now when he was thus compliant, though under no obligation so to be, I see not why you should reproach him as a Non-conformist Preacher. You might as well call him a Separatist, because at *Ephesus* Act. 19. 9. he departed, from those that spake evil of the way, and separated the Disciples, disputing daily in the School of one *Tyrannus*.

'Tis true, that St. Paul did preach some Doctrines which were not pleasing to the unconverted Jews: but this doth not make him a Non-conformist, so long as in Practice he did comply with what the Mosaic Law required of him. And 'tis possible (and perhaps you may think so) that some of our own Conformists may sometimes preach otherwise than according to the Established Doctrine of the Church of England, who yet would not be thought Non-conformists for so doing. Now, whether you intend it for a Reproach or a Commendation of St. Paul to call him a Non-conformist, however, when he makes it his business to Purge himself of this Imputation, and stands upon his Justification, that the Jews could not prove it upon him (nor can you) but that he walked orderly and kept the Law, and was, as touching the righteousness which is in the Law, blameless: You ought not to fasten upon St. Paul the nickname of a Non-conformist. Yet I do not take St. Paul to be such a Conformist, as to take All as he finds it (right or wrong) with those amongst whom he lives, or to swallow all without chewing (as your language

language is Rep. p. 59, 60.) But, wherein he might without sin, he was content to become all things to all men, that he might save some; he was willing, for the advantage of the Gospel, to comply in things which he thought Lawful, though not Necessary; as your self own (Enq. p. 122, 123.) as to his keeping the Pass-over at Jerusalem, though under no obligation to keep it. And the like I take to be, his going into the Jews Synagogue on their Sabbath-day; his Circumcising Timothy; his Purification in the Temple; his Shaving his head at Cenchrea, and the like. And so (for ought appears) as to the whole Mosaic Law.

Nor is he to be charged (for his compliance) as teaching one thing and practising the contrary (as you seem to insinuate Enq. p. 73.) For he taught indeed that the Gentiles were not to be brought under the Yoke of the Ceremonial Law (to which before they were not subject) but he doth no where teach (that I know of) that the Jews amongst the Gentiles might not observe it, if they were so perswaded. He bids the Gentiles, to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free Gal. 5. 1. Phil. 4. 1. But he doth no where forbid the Jews to wave that privilege (if they were so perswaded) upon a just occasion. And, according to this Doctrine was his Practice also, in Circumcising Timothy (because his Mother was a Jew,) but not Circumcising Titus, (who was a converted Gentile.) And, 'tis your great mistake not to distinguish between the Gentiles, and the Jews among the Gentiles; which distinction, if well considered, would set you right in many points whereat you stumble.

But, to return from this Digression in Vindication of St. Paul: I chewed those Papers, and particularly that passage which doth so much offend you, to Non-conformist Preachers (one or more) before 'twas Printed; who took no offense at it, nor made any exception to it. And I think it had been your wisdom (if you had not liked it) at least to say nothing of it, rather than to make so great an out-cry for nothing. What is that ill sense of the word Holding-forth which is commonly understood (you say) by all good and bad men, I do not know. I mean it in that sense in which Non-conformists were wont to use it, for that of Gifted-brethren in contradistinction to the Preaching of Non-conformist Ministers: 'Twas all one, as to my business, whether Paul did here speak, (as you are please to call him) as a Non-conformist Preacher, or as a Gifted-brother; for, either way, it was a Religious Exercise in a Christian Assembly on the first day of the week.

In the mean while, Do you think there are not some eminently Holy

*Holy and learned Conforming Ministers* (yes, and *Non-conformists* too) which do observe the *Christian Sabbath*, with whom you make bold all along, as *worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*, (beside many other unhandsome insinuations,) when there was no occasion for it.

Now, if you be not *angry*, (as *Rep. p. 38.* you say I am) or if your heat be a little over that we may talk calmly, I see not why *διαλέγω* may not here be well translated *Preached*, as our Translators have rendered it. That the word may be so rendered, you do not deny; for (*Eng. p. 45, 55.* and *Repl. p. 32.*) you would have it so rendered *Act. 17. 2.* and *Act. 18. 4.* And why you would have it so rendered there, but not here, I can guess at no other Reason, but one of these two; Either because our Translators there have said *Reasoned*, and here *Preached*, and therefore (because there may be some pleasure in contradicting and finding fault) you would have the contrary: Or else because, what is there said, was on the *Jewish Sabbath* (where you think the *highest expression* fit to be used,) but in this place, being but on the *first day of the week*, you think *Preaching* too good a word. But since *διαλέγω* may be rendered by either word, according as may best suit with the Circumstances of the place: I think our Translators have, with very good judgment, so rendered it as they have done in all those places. The Discourse of *Paul at Thessalonica Act. 17. 2.* and of *Aquila at Corinth Act. 18. 4.* doth not seem to have been a *Continued Discourse* (such what we use to call *Preaching*;) but an *Interrupted Conference* (*Dialogue-wise*) *Convincing the Jews and Greeks* by way of *Arguings, Answers, and Replis*: And while he did thus *διαλέγων Dialogue-wise*, it was more proper to call it *Reasoning or Disputing* (as *Act. 17. 17. Act. 18. 19. Act. 19. 9.*) than to call it *Preaching* and therefore was well rendered *Reasoned* in those places: But in the present place *Act. 20. 7.* it was a *Continued discourse*, not *Arguing with them*, (by way of *Dialogue*;) but making a *continued Speech to them*; which is therefore called *ῥήσιν*, not *διάλογον*, and is fitly rendered *Preaching*. But whether in a *Continued or Interrupted discourse*, 'tis all one as to our Business; for *Catechising* is a *Religious Discourse*, as well as *Preaching*. And you are no way advanced in your affair, but quarrelling at the Translation.

Another Exception (I must not call it a *Cavil*, though that word be frequent with you) is about the words *To break bread*, which you will not allow us to understand of the *Lords Supper*. But neither doth this advance your business at all; for whether they did or did not celebrate the *Lords Supper*, 'twas at least a *Christian Assembly*.

*Assembly* (and you affirm it so to be *Rep. p. 33.*) on the *first day of the week*. This *breaking of bread*, you say *Eng. p. 56, 57.* (to which you refer *Repl. p. 32.*) *might be to receive the Lords Supper together*, (as doubtless it was) or it might be (you say) for *common eating or supping together* (as friends commonly do, when a Minister or any special acquaintance intends to take a journey in the morning, to sup with him over night.) But do you think this was so? If not, to what purpose is this objection? That *Breaking of bread* is elsewhere used for the *Lords Supper* you do not deny, nor seem to doubt; and why not here? I do not know that the phrase is any where used in all the New Testament in any other sense. What you allege of Christs *breaking the loaves and fishes* (*Mat. 14. 19.* and *Mat. 15. 36.* and *Mark 8. 6, 19.*) for a *miraculous feeding of the multitude*, is nothing to the purpose; for that's another phrase and form of speech (on another occasion) from this of *breaking bread*, indefinitely. What you allege of *Paul Act. 27. 35.* when he had thus spoken, *he took bread, and gave thanks to God in presence of them all, and when he had broken it, he began to eat*; May be the *Lords Supper*, for ought I know, with other *Christians* then in the ship with him. 'Tis the same form of speech with that of Christ *Luk. 22. 19.* *Mat. 26. 26.* *He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave them, saying, Take, eat, &c.* And why it should not here be understood in the same sense, I see not. If all in the ship were not *Christians*, (as it's likely they were not all) yet I see not why those of them which were so, might not there celebrate the *Lords Supper*, on that occasion. For *St. Paul* was not ashamed to own himself a *Christian*, even in that company. And that of *Act. 20. 11.* seems plainly so to be, *They came together to break bread ver. 7.* and *they did break bread before they parted, ver. 11.* (though interrupted a while by the fall of *Eutychus*.) That is, they did celebrate the *Lords Supper ver. 11.* for which they came together *ver. 7.* On the *first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break Bread, Paul preached unto them being ready to depart on the morrow----- and when he had Broken Bread----- he departed.* Why should we not think this *breaking of bread* to be that *breaking of bread* for which they came together. But I press this no further, because *Repl. p. 132, 134.* you seem content to admit it without farther insisting on it, save only referring to what was said before.

Another scruple we have about *μὴ συνάγειν* (for we must dispute every inch of ground) and it comes twice; as to this place of *Act. 20. 7.* and as to that of *1 Cor. 16. 2.* whether *μὴ συνάγειν* do signify the

the first day of the week: and you think much (Repl. p. 34.) that I should call it trifling; which is, you say, a hard word. (I could have given it a harder word; but know not well by what softer name to call it than trifling.) It may be remembered, you say (Enq. p. 57.) the Greek word *μία* signifies One, and *ἐν μία ἡμέρᾳ* is rendered (not the First, but) One, about an hundred times in our Translation of the New Testament; and (p. 58.) *μία σαββάτων* (which we translate the first day of the week) you render by one of the Sabbaths, and to the same purpose Repl. p. 34.

Now 'tis very true that *μία* in Greek doth signify One, (and it may be so translated, for ought I know, as often as you say.) But if you were so good a Critick as to correct the Translation, you might have known that *μία σαββάτων* cannot signify One of the Sabbaths, for then it should have been *ἑν σαββάτῳ*, because *σαββάτω* is the Neuter Gender. Would you think *Una Sabbatorum* to be good Latine for one of the Sabbaths? And you do not much mend it when you say, One of the week meaning One day of the week; for if by one you mean some one, it should then be *ἡ μία ἡμέρα*, not *μία ἡμέρα*. And Mat. 28. 1. it dawned or drew near *ἐν τῇ μίᾳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* to the one, not to some one day indefinitely, but to that certain day which was known by the name of *μία σαββάτων*, and so here *ἐν τῇ μίᾳ* in The one, &c. And what that one is, you may learn in Mar. 16. where what is called *μία σαββάτων* ver. 1. is *ἡ πρώτη σαββάτων* ver. 9. both signifying the same thing the first day of the week. And in Gen. 1. 5. where *echad* in the Hebrew, and *μία* in the Greek, do properly signify One, yet you scruple not to render it (again and again) the evening and the morning was the first day, (not one day,) even after I shewed you that both in the Hebrew and in the Greek it is One. For we are to understand words in such a candid sense as in common-intendment may be reasonably supposed to be meant, not according to what force may be put upon them. As (in the instance I gave you, how slight soever you make of it,) five pound (singly considered) may signify five pound of candles as well as five pound of money; but he that sells a horse for five pound shall be presumed to intend it of money (not of candles.) And, though *μία* be Greek for One, yet when the known sense of *μία σαββάτων* is commonly understood to be what we call the first day of the week, (and no where known to be used in any other sense) 'tis captious to render it one day of the week, thereby meaning some one. If I called it child's play (as you object Repl. p. 34,) it is because I thought you might have been taught at School (as I was) that *μία σαββάτων* signifies the first day of the week. See more to this purpose Disc. p. 30, 31. and again

again p. 39, 40, 41, 42. Where, to help your Criticism, I give you the true construction of those words *μία σαββάτων*, which are well translated the first day of the week (for this is the day designed by those words, and this the most familiar or usual expression for it) but it is not a literal translation; the words be Elliptical, and to be thus supplied, *μία (ἡμέρα ἑνὶ) σαββάτῳ*, that is one (day after the) Sabbath, (the Substantive *ἡμέρα* being understood in the Adjective *μία*, and the Proposition *ἐν* before the Genitive case *σαββάτῳ*) which is the same in sense with the first day of the week. And such Elliptical or short forms of Expression (in words of frequent use) are very familiar in all Languages; You may remember *Ventum erat ad Vestæ* (subaudi Templum;) *hujus video Byrriam*, (subaudi servum;) in the same form of speech as we say, I came to St. Mary's Church; I was at Trinity, meaning Trinity College; I saw your Robert, meaning your Man Robert; or your John, meaning your Son John; and (Enq. p. 119.) you put *Sabbati* for die Sabbati; and this for in die Sabbati. And you oft refer us to the Word, meaning the Word of God contained in the holy Scriptures; (and I am willing so to understand you all along,) would you have me here argue, that there be many Words beside the Word of God, and by Word you may signify somewhat else? So, He preached at Peters Cornhill, meaning St. Peters (Church, in) Cornhill: He lives in Margarets Westminster, meaning St. Margarets (Parish, in) Westminster; So in the Strand London, meaning the Strand (near) London; and Bennets Pauls-wharf, meaning St. Bennets (Church, near) Pauls-wharf, and Pauls-wharf, meaning the wharf (near to the Church of St.) Paul: and you can hardly read the Superfcription of a Letter, but you will meet with such short forms of speech. So in Latine *tertio Calendas*, is *tertio* (die ante) Calendas; and in Greek *μία σαββάτων*, is *μία (ἡμέρα ἑνὶ) σαββάτῳ*, one (day after the) Sabbath; that is, the first day of the week. And as one hour after twelve is one a-clock, two hours after twelve is two a-clock, three hours after twelve is three a-clock; so one day after the Sabbath, is the first day of the week, two days after the Sabbath is the second day of the week, three days after the Sabbath is the third day of the week; which is easily understood by any who is not disposed to (Cavil I was about to say, but let it be so) make needless Exceptions. And I find that at length (Repl. p. 34.) you are content to say by *μία σαββάτων* Act. 20. 7. I think may mean the first day of the week, (you should rather have said, I think it is meant; surely you will not say, you think it is not so meant;) yet you are still hankering upon your *μία* signifies One, and it doth so,) but you should remember also that it is not *ἡ μία* (some

(*some one*) but *not* a determinate one, sufficiently designed by this name: (on *that* day which is *one day after the Sabbath*.) And then, that it is not the same to say *one day of the week*, (as you would have it) as to say *one day after the Sabbath* (that is, the *first day of the week*,) like as it is not the same to say *one hour of the day*, as to say *one hour after twelve*. So that I hope you will not question hereafter but that it was on the *first day of the week* that Paul did there *preach* and celebrate the *Lords Supper at Troas*. But since you are now content to allow (*Rep. p. 28, 34. Eng. p. 58.*) that by *μία παρὰ τὴν* is generally meant the first day of the week, and in some places certainly so meant, and may be so meant in this place, and *probably* is so meant here, (to which you may add, that it doth not appear *any where* to be otherwise meant, nor do you offer any reason or pretense of reason *why not* so meant here as it is every where else,) I hope you will not be offended with me for calling it *trifling* to tell us again and again (and yet to insist upon it) that *μία* signifies *one*. If in an Argument at *Westminster-hall*, when it doth appear that such a thing was done *one hour after twelve a-clock*, you should still insist upon it that *six a-clock* is *one hour*, and that it is *after twelve*, and therefore this might be at *six a-clock* (or any other hour of the day) and would be thought in earnest when you so argue; you would not be offended if the *Bar* or the *Bench* should take this to be *trifling*, and the best excuse that could be made for it, would be, *Surely he is not in earnest*.

But you are content (*Eng. p. 55, 56, 57. Repl. p. 33, 34.*) to compromise the matter; you will allow this to be the first day of the week, if we will admit *Sunday-night* to begin on *Saturday at Sun-set*. (That is, if it may serve your turn, it shall be the first day of the week: otherwise, it shall not.) *It seems to you*, you say; (it may be so;) and you think to these Objectors also (pray forbear to say that any more) that Paul's preaching on the first day of the week, and continuing his speech till *midnight*, was the *Evening after the Seventh day*, (that is, on *Saturday night*) Paul being to depart on the *morrow*, that is on *Sunday*; and that *after Supper* (on *Saturday-night*) Paul preached to them and talked long till *break of day*, and then departed, which seems to be *Sunday-morning*. And you are not pleased that I should think this a pleasant shift, which seems to you a plain and true fact, *Repl. p. 33*. But however it seem to you, pray forbear to think it so seems to the objectors: for I believe you are the first that ever thought so; the first who ever thought, that those who produce this place for the *Sunday Sabbath*, do understand

of Paul's preaching on *Saturday-night*, being ready to depart on *Sunday-morning*. And you allow your self a great latitude in thinking, when you think it doth so seem to them. But do you indeed think so? Or may I return you your own words, *Repl. p. 35*. *I hope you will not oblige me, or any other, to believe you so think?*

But this is to usher in another debate, at *what time* the day did then begin; of which conceit you seem to be very full; that *Sunday-night* was what others call *Saturday-night*, beginning at *Sun-set* on *Saturday*; and that this was the language there (at that time) of St. Luke and the other sacred Writers; and all this, because *The morning and the evening was the first day*, Gen. 1. 5.

Now I had shewed it very plain, *Disc. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32*. that as well in the New Testament as in the Old, the *Evening* was always reckoned to belong to the *day past*. We find, by the story we have of Christ's Resurrection (*Mat. 28. Mar. 14. Luk. 24. Joh. 20.*) that on the *first day of the week*, very early in the morning, while it was yet dark, the women came to the Sepulchre; not over-night, (though the Sun, at that time of the Year, did set about six a-clock) because the Sabbath was not yet past, and they were to rest on the Sabbath according to the Commandment. When they came there, the Body was risen, and Christ appeared to them, and bid them tell it to the Disciples, which they did; after which, Peter and John (from the rest) went to the Sepulchre and found it to be so, and brought such word back to the rest; and in the mean time the souldiers (affrighted) told to the high Priests what had happened, who gave them money to say, The Disciples had stolen away the Body while they slept; and all this happened before the two Disciples went toward *Emmaus*, (for they told it to Christ by the way.) After that, they went on foot (they walked) to *Emmaus*, which you allow to be *seven mile and a half*; when they came near to *Emmaus*, the day was far spent, and they perswade Christ, (who seemed willing to go further) to stay with them, as not being convenient, unless upon some great occasion, to travel further that night. He there staid with them, continued to preach to them, and did with them celebrate the *Lords Supper* before they perceived who he was. After this, they returned to *Jerusalem*, (another seven miles and half) and told this to the Disciples. After which, Christ also appeared to them, upbraided their unbelief, confirmed their Faith, preached to them the Doctrine of his Death and Resurrection out of *Moses*, the *Psalms*, and the *Prophecs*; gave them his solemn Benediction, conferred on them the Holy-Ghost, ordained them to that office, and gave them Com-

mission

mission for preaching the Gospel, and planting the Christian Church, with Instructions concerning it: Now can any man believe, that all this could be dispatched before six a-clock (the time of Sun-set at that season) when yet it was so late when they drew near to *Emmaus* as that it was inconvenient to travel further? Yet all this was but *the same day in the evening, the first day of the week*, Joh. 10. 19. *when the doors were shut* (near bedtime.) The day therefore, which began before Sun-rising, was not ended at Sun-set, nor for a good while after. Nor did the new day begin at (the beginning of) the Evening; especially if you bring back *the Evening* so far as to *three a-clock* Repl. p. 28. or even to *Mid-day* p. 29.

The same I argued from the day of the Crucifixion. 'Twas toward Evening before the Crucifixion was over. For 'twas after *the sixth hour* (that is, our Noon) when *Pilate delivered him to the Jews to be crucified, and they led him away*. Joh. 19. 14, 16. after which a *Cross* was to be provided for him to carry to Mount Calvary, (about as far from Jerusalem on the one side as Mount Olivet is on the other; which you tell us Repl. 35, 36. was about two miles off,) and it may be reasonably supposed they did not travel very fast, when he was to carry the *Cross* all the way, or (when he failed under it) *Simon of Cyrene* for him. When they came there, the *Cross* was to be erected, and he fastened to it. By which time it might be about *three a-clock* or the *ninth hour*. And some-while after the *ninth hour* (that is after three a-clock) he cried, *Eli, Eli, lamina sabachthani*; whereupon they *mocked* him, as calling for *Elias*; and the *two thieves* (or one of them) *reviled* him. Then they went (how far I know not) and fetched a *sponge* and gave him *gall and vinegar to drink*; after all this (how long after we know not) he *cried Again with a loud voice and gave up the Ghost*. And 'tis likely enough (though it be not expressly said so) to be about *Sun-set* when he thus gave up the *Ghost*; that as Christ died on the *same day*, so at the *same hour*, at which the *Paschal Lamb* was to be sacrificed, at the going down of the Sun. Deut. 16. 6. And it was about *Sun-set*, when the souldiers came and *brake the legs of the two thieves* because they were not dead when it was time to take them down from the *Cross*, (that is, as you intimate Repl. p. 30. from *Josh. 10. 26, 27. at the going down of the Sun*, consonant to that of *Josh. 8. 39. and Deut. 21. 23.*) And then (by the way) if the Thieves were yet alive, how is it that Christ says to one of them, *This Day thou shalt be with me in Paradise*, unless *this day* did reach beyond *Sun-set*. But, after all this, it was later yet when *Joseph* begged his

his Body from *Pilate*; for 'tis expressly said, *When Even was come, Joseph begged his body*; that is after *Sun-set*, (for Repl. p. 30. you take pains to prove, from many places, *That the Evening doth begin at Sun-set*;) which was not granted presently, (for *Pilate* doubted whether he were yet dead, and demurred till he was satisfied therein; which must be from some who came thence, at two miles distance from Jerusalem, after he was dead;) and when it was granted, there must be some time to go back again from *Pilate* to Mount Calvary, and there to take down the body, to buy fine linen, to wrap it in a clean linen-cloth, to bury it in his Tomb; yet the Sabbath was not begun, for after this, 'tis expressly said that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on; Yet after this the women, who saw the sepulchre and how the body was laid, returned home, (from thence to Jerusalem, I suppose) and prepared spices and ointments (the same night) yet rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment. But all this, you say, might well be before *Sun-set*. Pray, how so? since *Evening begins at Sun-set*, Repl. p. 30. and *Evening was come before Joseph begged the body of Pilate*, Mat. 27. Mar. 15. Luk. 23. How then can, all that followed, be done before *Sun-set*? If you think it was, you may continue so to think, if you please; but you must give me leave to think otherwise. When therefore so much was done after the *Evening was come* (that is after *Sun-set*) and the Sabbath not yet begun; the Sabbath did not begin at *Sun-set* as you would have it.

Nor did it End at *Sun-set* the next day. For the Women, who had prepared spices and ointments the night before, might that night, after six a-clock, have applied them; (for the darkness would not hinder them, it being then but just past the Full Moon, if past, and they would it seems have done it the night before, notwithstanding the darkness, but that the Sabbath came on so soon as not to afford them time enough, and they did come the next morning while it was yet dark,) but, because the Sabbath was not yet over, and they were to rest the Sabbath-day according to the commandment, they waited till the next morning before they could come to anoint the Corps. I add also, that if the Sabbath had ended at six a-clock, and the day after the Sabbath had then begun, Christ might have risen that Evening, (as well as the next Morning) for the third day had been then begun. Yet, on the other hand, (since 'tis manifest that Christ was not buried till after *Sun-set*) if that Evening had not been part of the sixth day, he had not been three days and three nights, (that is, three *whole* times) in the heart of the Earth, that is, in the grave. (for it had been but part of

of the second and part of the third, but no part of the first,) 'Tis manifest therefore that the *Evening* at the end of the sixth day was part of the sixth day; and the *Evening* at the end of the seventh day was part of the seventh day (not as you would have it here, the first day of the week.) And consequently Paul's preaching on the first day of the week till midnight ready to depart the next morning was not on Saturday-night (and he to depart on Sunday-morning,) but it was on Sunday-night and he to depart on Monday-morning. And therefore the Doctor's Mid-night-day, as you please to call it *Rep. p. 30, 33.* (that is from Midnight to Midnight) is not mistaken, as there you think.

So *Act. 23. 32.* The chief Captain being informed by Paul's Kinsman of a conspiracy to kill Paul, *ver. 19, 20, 21.* gave order to make ready two hundred souldiers to go to Cæsarea at the Third hour of the night (which certainly was after Sun-set) to bring Paul safe to Felix the Governour, *ver. 23, 24.* And the souldiers, as was commanded them, took Paul and brought by night (*ὥς ἡ νύκτας*, that night) to Antipatris, *ver. 11. 32.* On the morrow (*τῇ ἑαυτερον*) they (the souldiers) left the horsemen to go with him, and returned to the Castle, *ver. 32.* so that the next morning, was (not the same day, but) the morrow after the third hour of the night foregoing. Which morrow did not then begin at Sun-set, but at least later than the third hour of the night: And you do acknowledge (*Rep. p. 29.*) that the Romans then did reckon their days from Midnight to Midnight, which were therefore as you call them (wittily no doubt) *Midnight-days*: And you own, that our English Day is also a *Midnight-day*, from Mid-night to Midnight: and 'tis so reputed in Westminster-hall. And so you tell us *Eng. p. 83.* that from Midnight to Midnight, is the *Reckoning of this Kingdom.* And what do you reply to all this Evidence? The Evening and the Morning were the first day must answer all.

I shewed you further, that even in the Old Testament it was so also. The Paschal Lamb was to be killed in the first Month on the Fourteenth day in the Evening, *Exod. 12. 6, 18, Levit. 23. 5. Numb. 28. 16. Deut. 16. 6.* Do you think this to be that at the end of the thirteenth day? No; but that at the end of the Fourteenth day. And it must be all eaten that night, nothing of it must remain till the morning, *Exod. 12. 18, 10.* that is, not after Mid-night, for when Midnight is past, Morning begins; What, nothing of it till the Morning of the Fourteenth day? Surely not so, but not till the Morning of the Fifteenth day. For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night (the night of this day, not to morrow-night, as if the night then following were the night of another day) and will smite all the

the first born *ver. 12.* and it came to pass at mid-night that the Lord smote all the first-born of the land of Egypt *ver. 18.* so that till mid-night was the fourteenth day at evening, (not the fifteenth.) So *Exod. 12. 6, 8.* on the fourteenth day they shall Kill it at evening, and they shall eat the flesh that Night (but before Mid-night) so that as well the Evening as the Night (at least till Mid-night) are reckoned to the fourteenth day. Yet you would have all dispatched before Sun-set. Again, They were to eat it with unleavened bread, and all leaven to be that night put away, and no leaven to be found in their houses, *ver. 8. 18, 19, 20.* What, no leaven on the fourteenth day? surely there might. Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread, *ver. 15.* and seven days shall no leaven be found in your houses, *ver. 19.* And the first of those Seven is the fifteenth day (not the Fourteenth,) therefore on the fourteenth day they might have Leaven; but from the fourteenth day at Even they might not; therefore the fourteenth day at Even was the end of the Fourteenth day (not the beginning of it, and therefore not at the end of the Thirteenth day) and this evening continued till mid-night, therefore so long continued the Fourteenth day. Now from the fourteenth day at evening, (that is, from the end of that Evening,) till the one and twentieth day at evening, (that is, till the end of this Evening,) ye shall eat unleavened bread; seven days shall no leaven be found in your houses; *ver. 18, 19.* of which seven days, the fifteenth is the first. So *Levit. 23. 32.* From even to even, I take to be from the end of one Evening to the end of the next, with which you are not pleased, *Rep. p.* But (you say *Rep. p. 30.*) The Evening does begin at Sun-set (and take pains to prove it;) True: But it doth not end at Sun-set: It continues till Mid-night. And from the end of one evening, to the end of the next, is from Mid-night to Mid-night. And I have been told (by Men of your Profession) that from the day of the date hereof, is from the End of that day; that is, from the Mid-night following. (And, you know, some great Cafes have turn'd upon this point.) And in what you cite, *Eng. p. 127.* (which place I doubt you mis-understood) about the Observation of the Pascha (that is Easter-day) from the Fourteenth of the Moon to the Twenty first; the meaning is not that the Pascha did all that while continue, but that these were the *limites Paschales* or *termini Paschales* (as they are wont to be called) within which the Pascha was to be kept; that is, From the end of the fourteenth day, to the end of the one and twentieth. Not so soon as the Fourteenth day, nor later than the one and twentieth, but on that Lord's-day (which could be but one) which did fall within these limits. Which is

the known meaning of those words. So *Levit. 23. 5, 6.* *The fourteenth day of the first month at Even, is the Lords Pass-over, and on the fifteenth day is the feast of unleavened bread; seven days ye must eat unleavened bread.* And *Numb. 28. 16, 17.* *The fourteenth day of the first month is the Pass-over of the Lord; and in the fifteenth day is the feast; seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten.* So *Num. 33. 3.* *They departed from Rameses in the first month, on the fifteenth day of the first month, on the morrow after the Pass-over; Now the Lords Pass-over (wherein he slew the Egyptians and passed-over the Israelites) was about midnight on the fourteenth day at even; and presently upon it (before the morning light) the Israelites were sent out on the fifteenth day, It came to pass at Midnight the Lord smote all the first-born, --- and Pharaoh rose up in the Night, --- and called for Moses and Aaron by Night, and said Rise up, get ye forth, --- And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people that they might send them out of the land in Hast, --- and the children of Israel travelled for Rameses to Succoth, &c. *Exod. 12. 29, 30, 31, 37.* So that just after midnight was the Morrow after what was just before midnight. We have found therefore a mid-night-day (as you call it) even in the Old Testament. And *Deut. 16. 6.* *Thou shalt sacrifice the Pass-over at even, at the going down of the Sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt, (which was, midnight, *Exod. 11. 4. Exod. 12. 21.*) So that from Sun-set to Midnight is the time within which the Pass-over was to be Killed, and Roasted, and Eaten, and no part of it to remain till morning, (that is not after midnight, for then morning begins;) and what follows is the morrow after, and a new day: That was the Fourteenth, This is the Fifteenth.**

But in *Exod. 12. 6.* they shall kill the Pass-over in the evening; or between the two evenings; you take the first of these evenings to begin either at our three a'clock in the afternoon, or presently after Mid-day, between which and Sun-set (you say) there might be time enough to kill and dress it without running up the time to midnight. I will not here press you with what you take pains to prove Reply, p. 29, 30. that the evening begins at Sun-set, when the evening comes, is, when the Sun is down, p. 30. (though I should think the beginning of the evening should be the first evening, not the last.) But I desire you to consult *Deut. 16. 6.* where you will find it was to be killed, not at three a'clock in the afternoon, nor presently after mid-day, but at the going down of the Sun, at the season that thou camest out of Egypt. Now, if it must be killed at the going down of the Sun, where shall we find time to kill it, dress it, roast it and eat it, without running up the time beyond Sun-set? Whether till mid-night or no is not

not necessary, for if never so little beyond Sun-set, it must (according to your notion) trespass upon the fifteenth day, (whereas the Pass-over is all to be dispatched on the fourteenth day; and the fifteenth day is the morrow after the Pass-over:) And, how far we may run it up beyond Sun-set, the next words tell you, at the season that thou camest out of Egypt, which was about midnight: so that I think the case is plain, that between the two evenings, is between Sun-set and Midnight; for it must not be killed before Sun-set, and it must be all eaten before midnight, (nothing of it must be left till the morning.) It is plain therefore, that till the end of the Lords Pass-over (which was at midnight or just before) was the fourteenth day; and the fifteenth day was the morrow after. The fifteenth day therefore did not begin on the fourteenth day at Sun-set, but at Midnight.

And Nehemiah, when he would Restore the Observation of the Sabbath which had been long intermitted (during the Captivity, and long before, as you tell us, *Eng. p. 39. 63.*) did not reckon it to begin at Sun-set, nor for a good while after, *Neb. 13. 19.* *When the gates of Jerusalem began to be Dark before the Sabbath, I commanded the gates to be shut &c. Not at Sun-set, but when the Gates began to be dark, which is not till a good while after Sun-set, and yet even that was before the Sabbath.* The Sabbath was not yet begun, but the Gates shut, by way of prevention, when it grew toward the ordinary time of ceasing to go in and out; yet even then they were not so shut but that, upon occasion, they might be opened to let in ordinary passengers, (though not for those who brought merchandise to sell on the Sabbath-day,) and for that purpose left his servants at the gates, that there should no Burden be brought in.

Now I think, in all reason, you ought to have given some tolerable answer to these allegations, or else not tell us *Rep. 75.* that you have not (you think) declined any thing that required a farther Reply. These allegations seem to me (and I suppose will so to the Reader) not so weak as to be slighted. And till you have answered them, I shall not easily believe, that Pauls preaching to them at Troas on the first day of the week, and continuing his speech till midnight, is to be understood of Saturday night he being to depart on Sunday morning.

But since the whole stress is laid upon *The Evening and Morning* were the first day, we'll consider that a while.

I will not quarrel with you for calling it the First day, though you know that both *echad* in the Hebrew, and *μία* in the Greek, do signify One in English, (not the First.) For though One while it is alone

(and so considered) be, in propriety of speech, no more *the first* than the *last*, (for *first* is a Relative word, and there can be no *Relate* without a *Correlate*;) yet if what was *then* but *One*, be considered with respect to what then *was to be*, and since *both been*, it may (so considered) be called *the First*. Nor would I have quarelled with you if (instead of *first*) you had called it *One day* (as it is both in the Hebrew and in the Greek) provided, by *one day*, you do not mean (indefinitely) *some one day* (as if instead of *one* it had been *one*) but *One certain (Definite) day*; that day which, when there should be another, will become the *First* (as had been in the time when *Moses* Wrote, though not on the day whereof he Spake;) for whether you call it *One day* (as then it was) or the *First day* (as it was to be when there came a *Second*) is all one to me, for 'tis the same thing either way.

Nor will I quarel with you for translating it (as we do) the *Evening and the Morning Were the first day*, though you know that in the Original it is no more but *there Was Evening and there Was Morning the first day*, and it is so rendered in other Translations: But I would have you consider, that there can be no more concluded from it (however we translate it) than if it were so translated as it is in the Original.

If I then argue (at the rate you do) that though it be said *there was Evening and there was Morning the First day*, and *there was evening and there was morning the Sixth day*, yet it is not said there was Evening and there was Morning the *Seventh day*, (we do not so Read, nor is it so Written;) and if you reply (which you will not allow me to do) *we may Reasonably suppose* that it was so on the Seventh day and every day since; and I should rejoin to you (as you do *Repl. p. 27.*) *this is but Supposed, not in the Word, which Word is the Wisdome of God, and the highest Reason, or (as Rep. p. 36.) I know no Word for that, or other Ground but Conjecture, or some Romish Traditions*; This were to give you your own Law: But, if I should thus argue (and put weight upon it) I would allow You to call it *Trifling*, or *Shifting*, (or *Cavilling*, if you please, or by some other harder name:) For I do think, there may be Reason to believe what is not expressly written; and that, by what is Written we may judge what is most likely to be true, of what is not written. And, I find, you do allow your self the liberty (though you will not allow it us) to suppose many things which are not Written. And a great many of your Arguments begin with *I think* and *I suppose*.

But though I do not think fit to take this advantage, yet Mr. *Answorth*, a learned Non Conformist (for whose Authority you may per-

perhaps therefore have the more reverence) in his Translation of the *five Books of Moses*, thinks fit to take notice of this difference of the *seventh day*, from the *six fore-going* (as if, in his judgment, we might not safely argue from *those to this*;) in his Annotations on those words *he blessed it Gen. 2. 3.* (as a day of *delight and feasting*;) wherefore (saith he) this day is not described by *Evening and Morning*, as were the other six, which consisted of *light and darkness*; but this all Day (or Light) figuring out our perpetual Joys. How far the authority of this eminently Holy and Learned Non-Conformist, to speak in your own Language (for so I take him to have been a good man, and a learned man, notwithstanding his Non-conformity,) will sway with you, I cannot tell; but, on whatever time the other days did begin, he seems to begin the *seventh day* with *Light*, not at Sun-set when Night was coming-on.

Yet I shall allow you (though it be not Written) that there was on the Seventh day (taking in the whole 24 hours) Darknes as well as Light.

But withal, when God is said to *Rest* on the seventh day, or (as you please to render it) to *Sabbatize* on the seventh day; this I suppose, you would have to be understood not barely of a *Negative Rest*; that is, *not-Creating*; (for then he did as much Rest or Sabbathize on the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth day, and so forward;) but to include somewhat *Positive* (what ever that were) on this day performed: And accordingly Man's Celebration of a Sabbath; in like manner: Else to *sleep* or be *idle* all the day, would be a sufficient Sanctification of the Sabbath; which I think you will not allow. Now, at what Time of the Seventh day, God did thus Bless and Sanctify it, by such *Positive* Sanctification, we do no more know, than at what time of the First day he said *Let there be Light*; or at what time of the Fourth day he made the *Sun*. So that we are yet in the dark, (according to this rule) at what time of the day this *Holy Rest* doth begin, if we must begin our Sabbath (as you would have it) just at such time of the day as God began his.

But I would then tell you, that it is not Written, (nor do we Read) in the Word, that the *Seventh day* (nor indeed any other day) doth begin at Sun-set. I am sure the *First day* did not, nor the *Second*, nor the *Third*, nor (I think) the *Fourth*; nor can you shew (in Scripture) that ever any day did so begin. I am sure, at the Pass-over, that the *Fourteenth day* did End at (or very near) *Midnight*, and the *Fifteenth day* did then begin; not at Sun-set. And the *Sixth day* (on which Christ was Crucified) did not End at Sun-set, but a great while after. And the *First day* (on which Christ rose)

rose) did neither Begin, nor End, at Sun-set. And when you can shew me, so plainly, that ever any day (in Scripture) did so Begin or End, it will then be time to give you a further Answer.

But when you tell us *Rep. p. 69.* that *Evening and Morning did constitute and make up every day in the week*; pray what do you think of *Noon*? was that no part of the day? or, did it continue *Morning* till *Sun-set*? Pray shew me some *Word* where it is so *Written* or where I may *Read* it; or must we take your *Word* for it? That *Morning* begins early while it is yet dark I knew; but that it continues *Morning* till *Sun-set* I did not know. If by *Evening and Morning*, you understand *Darkness and Light*, (as you now expound it *Rep. p. 25. 67.*) I am contented so to understand it (though it be not so *Written*,) and I grant that, there was *darkness* and there was *light* the first day (and so of the rest) but I do not grant that the *First day* did begin at *Sun-set*. You'll say perhaps that *Darkness* was before *Light*. True: (*Darkness was upon the face of the deep* before God said *Let there be Light*, *Gen. 1. 2, 3.*) But so it might be though the day began at *Midnight*. Can you tell me *How long* it was dark, before God said *Let there be Light*? Was it just Twelve hours? neither more nor less? as it ought to be at the Vernal Equinox (where you set up your Scheme *Rep. p. 72, 73.*) if the day begin at *Sun-set*. Pray shew me where I shall find that. Yet this you must shew, before you can thence prove, that the *First day* did begin at *Sun-set*, or just *twelve hours* before it be light. It might be Six hours, or not so much, for ought you or I do know, or can know. You tell us (*Rep. p. 67.*) *You do not know at what time of the fourth day God created the Sun*: and we do as little know at what time of the first day he said *Let there be Light*.

But suppose this also (that it was dark for just twelve hours, before God said *Let there be Light*) what then? Therefore, you say, *The seventh day at the creation did begin as the three first days, and the other week-days did, that is in the evening at or about sun set and lasted 24 hours, from evening to evening*, *Rep. p. 68.* (But, that the three first days did begin at or about *Sun-set* (when as yet there was no Sun) seems to me new doctrine.) And *Rep. p. 73.* it seems (to you) demonstrable, that every day of the week began every where in the evening round the world as the Sun did set. But stay a while. Was there not a moment when God's Rest did begin *Gen. 2. 2*? And if God's Rest were to be man's Rule, was not the Sabbath then to begin? But, at whatever moment that was, if it were then *Sun-set* in one place, it was *Sun-rising* at another, and *Noon* at a third, and at a Fourth *Midnight*. (For surely it was not *sun-set* at the same

time all the World over.) What say you to this? You say *Repl. p. 67.* *If our Sabbath did begin at the same instant that Gods first Rest did, this were a hard objection.* But why not? why should not Mans Rest begin when Gods did? Because (*p. 69.*) *this were to stamp the question: And therefore you would not have all parts of the Earth tyed up to the precise moment of Gods Resting.* And *p. 67.* *You know no place in the Word where it is said, that every Sabbath after-ward was to begin the same moment that it began in Paradise?* But did not Gods first rest begin all the World over, at the same moment that it began in Paradise? Well: But if not so, How then? *The Sabbath then did* (you say) *and was afterward to begin in the evening every where.* Pray, shew me where I shall find that place in the Word, where it is said so.

You tell us indeed, *Rep. p. 67, 68.* (as a Reply to one of my Exordients,) that we may suppose the Sun when set in the Firmament, *Gen. 1. 17.* travelled westward round the earth daily, as it still doth. (Content.) And as the posterity of Adam (and so of Noah) travelled East, West, North or South, (not west-ward onely,) by degrees the earth was overspread (very good;) and into whatever country they came as the Sun did set, so every day of the week began (that is, you tell us so) and so on to this day; and (as *p. 73.*) in all places of the earth, as the Sun sets every where, so every where the Sabbath-day every other day of the week doth there begin and end, notwithstanding the difference of hours and minutes from the setting of the sun at Jerusalem. But this doth not answer what I urged, but confirms my Argument, and makes it out. For according to your scheme there (at *p. 72, 73.*) when you set out (in your imagination) and begin to reckon from Jerusalem (west-ward) and follow the sun as it goes round the Earth, till it comes about to Jerusalem again (and keep pace with it, in your imagination all the way, or reckon as if you did,) the same day (you tell us) begins at Rome, 11 hours later than at Jerusalem; at London, 3 hours and twelve minutes; at New England, 8 hours; and (still following the Sun from Jerusalem to Japan,) it sets at Japan 17 hours later than at Jerusalem; and in 7 hours more, from Japan to Jerusalem again; 17 and 7 being 24. That is, when you come back to Jerusalem, it will be still the same day (for the Sun hath not set, to you, all the way, who were travelled with it all the while, in your imagination, and kept pace with it,) but 24 hours later than when you set forth. That is, on seventh day continues on, when, to those whom you left behind, it is the first day (for, to those, the Sun had set in the mean time, though not to you who travelled with it.) And, if you then continue

continue there, *your seventh day* must be thenceforth concurrent with *their first day*: Which is the *Expedient* I offered you. And 'tis just the same case with that of Sir Francis Drake's *loosing a day* by sailing round the Earth; save that he lost the day by *parcel*, and you *all at once* (because your Imagination keeps pace with the Sun, but he could not sail so fast.) And though this day (by this means) become *longer by 24 hours* than another day; this alters not the case at all according to your doctrine; for so you tell *Enq. p. 39. One long day in Josuah's time, and another in Hezekiah's time, or the variety of the times of the Sun's setting in different Climates does no way disturb, for that a day longer or shorter than another by some hours is still a day, and but a day*: And so here, *Rep. p. 66. the two long days in Josuah's and Hezekiah's time make no alteration*. And if it be lost by parcels, (which is the case of Sir Francis Drake) 'tis the same thing, for he will certainly have *one Sun-set* fewer than those he left behind, and so (if at every Sun-set where ever you are, without considering what day it is at *Paradise* or *Jerusalem*, must begin a new day, and not till then, which is your doctrine,) *his Seventh day* (when he comes round) will be concurrent with *their first day* who stay'd behind, and so for ever after which is the *Expedient* I offered you. Again, what you feared *Repl. p. 66. that Christians in Turkey must keep this Sabbath on Fryday*. This will be unavoidably so, by your doctrine, to those who shall travel *Eastward* to *Japan* or the *East Indies*, and come round by the *Streights of Magellan*; for, as the other *loose a day*, they will *get a day*; and since you allow that the posterity of *Adam* or *Noah* may travel *Westward* as well as *Eastward* round the World. Their *Saturday* who thus travel *Eastward* will (when they come round) be coincident with the *Fryday* of those who stay'd behind according to your *Scheme*.

In the mean time; The *first day* did certainly begin at the *same moment* as to all the World; (the first moment wherein God began to create.) And if it began at once for all the World, must (after 24 hours according to your reckoning *Rep. p. 68*) End at once for all the World. And so the second, third, fourth day accordingly. Now if the sixth day do at once end all the World over, but the seventh day not then begin (but some hours after, be it 10, 12, or 23 hours, according to your Scheme *p. 73*.) then (as you argue *p. 68*.) *we loose so many hours*; which be no part of the *sixth day*, nor (to such) any part of the *seventh day* would cease (to them) to be any part of the week. How you will answer your own Argument I cannot tell: it seems to me somewhat difficult.

If, to avoid this, you will say (and 'tis the fairest you can offer and may perhaps be true) that, When God said, *Let there be light*, it was not presently light *all the World over*; but rather that God did then create a *Body of Light* (or a *Lightsome Body*) which did move round the Earth (as now the Sun doth,) and was to be seen successively at several places, one, two, ten, twelve or twenty hours after the darkness first began: If so; this destroys your first Hypothesis, that the First day did begin every where just twelve hours before it began to be light, that is, (as you phrase it) just at *Sun-set*, (before there was a Sun.)

But pray Sir consider, How unsafe arguing it is, to catch at a notion, or take up a fancy, and then run away with it, as if all were safe, because you so fancy; and force all other places (though never so contrary) to comply with this Fancy. All you have here to lay hold of, is no more but this, *There was Evening and there was Morning the first day*, that is, there was Darkness and there was Light the first day; and *Darkness was before Light*. Whence you conclude therefore *the first day did begin at Sun-set*. Might not all this be if it begin at Midnight (or at any other dark hour) as well as at Sun-set? or (for so I am willing to understand you, that it may look like sense,) just twelve hours (every where) before it (there) began to be light? I should think that you might as well conclude (from your premisses) that the day is to begin at Noon. For, that *Morning* may continue till Noon, I can allow you (though not till Sun-set;) and you can allow (to serve a turn) *Repl. p. 29* that *Evening* may begin presently after Mid day, (rather than the Pass-over should not be all dispatch'd by Sun-set;) And then from the *beginning of Evening* to the *end of Morning* must (by this Account) be from Noon to Noon.

Nor is any stress to be laid upon the order of words, (that *Evening* is named before *Morning*, or *Night* before *Day*;) for both are used promiscuously in Scripture, sometime *Night* before *Day*, and sometime *Day* before *Night*. *Psal. 1. 1, 2. Blessed is the man—whose delight is in the Law of the Lord, and he meditateth therein Day and Night*; and in many other places. And if you look no further than the *Fourth day*; *Gen. 1. God said, Let there be lights in the Firmament—to divide the day from the night, (or between the day and between the night,) ver. 14. And God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the Day, and the lesser light to rule the Night, ver. 16.—to rule over the Day and over the Night, and to divide the Light from the Darkness, ver. 18.* (There, we have *Day* before *Night*, and *Light* before *Darkness*.) So in *Exod. 29. 38, 39. Now*

this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar, two lambs of the first year, day by day, continually, the one lamb thou shalt offer in the Morning, and the other lamb thou shalt offer at Even. And in like manner Numb. 28. 3, 4. This is the offering made by fire which ye shall offer unto the Lord; two lambs of the first year without spot day by day for a continual burnt-offering: the one lamb shalt thou offer in the Morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer at Even: which for the Sabbath-day was to be doubled, ver. 9. 10. Where you see that (in both places) the Morning is put before the Evening. Though you are pleas'd (as to both places) to invert the order, Eng. p. 84. (but whether or no it were an Artifice I cannot tell) Their daily precise times, of Evening and Morning worship (say you) I know not, but onely Evening and Morning, Exod. 29. 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, Numb. 28. 4, 8. (Where also you put Evening and Morning in a different character, as more remarkable.) And so p. 83. Evening and Morning worship, — which Evening and Morning worship — is not to be intermitted upon the Sabbath-day: and for this see Numb. 28. 3, 4, 8, 9. You may observe also that (even for the Sabbath) the Evening Sacrifice is in the end of the day (after the Morning Sacrifice,) not over-night (in the Evening before,) so that the Morning of the Sabbath was before the Evening of the Sabbath. I forbear to cite other places where Morning is put before Evening: But these two I thought fit to mention to Rectify your Inverting the order of the Words; putting the Evening and Morning worship instead of Morning and Evening, as it is in the Texts you cite.

And 'tis very weak to lay any strength meerly on the order of words in such a case. In Gen. 2. 4. These are the generations of the Heavens and of the Earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord made the Earth and the Heavens: Which of these shall we here conclude to be first made?

I have now done with this Digression (about what time the day is to begin); which you put us upon, hoping thereby to shift off this place of Act. 20. 7. from Sunday to Saturday-night.

A like place I said Disc. p. 38.) is that of 1 Cor. 16. 1, 2. But what likeness there is between these places you cannot see Repl. p. 37. I shew you. I had there said, that in some places, though single instances, there is intimation of a frequent usage; as Act. 20. 7. — and a like place is that of 1 Cor. 16. This likeness there is. That such intimation was in the former place, I had shewed before. And it is so here, Now concerning the Collection for the Saints, as I have given order in the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye: Upon the first day of

the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him; that there be no gathering when I come. Where it plainly appears, that the first day of the week, was wont to be observed both in the Churches of Galatia, and at Corinth. This the Apostle supposeth, when he directs what he would have done on those days; which is a work of charity, proper for such a day. Here *μία σάββατον* troubles you again, whether it may not be any day of the week as well as the first day of the week. I told you then Disc. p. 39. I did believe, your self thought it to be the First day. It is *μία ἡμέρα σάββατον* (on that day which is one day after the Sabbath.) And you now confess Repl. p. 28. You think that in the New Testament (and where else doth it not?) it is Generally meant the First day; and the First day is Certainly meant in some places. And this confession shall serve my turn, till you can shew some place (either in the New Testament or else where) in which it signifies otherwise; or, why it should not here so signify as every where else it doth. You then intimate Eng. p. 58. and again Rep. p. 37. as if it might be meant of a yearly Collection, because that (in pursuance I suppose of this direction) it is said in the second Epistle, 2 Cor. 3. 10. They had begun before, not onely to do, but to be forward, a year ago; And 2 Cor. 9. 1, 2. I boasted of you to them of Macedonia that Achaia (where Corinth stood) was ready a year ago. But why must this be a yearly collection rather than a weekly collection? might they not, a year ago, begin and be forward in such weekly collections? Yet you do confess Eng. p. 58. that, of yearly collections, nothing that you know is there expressly written. But, whether Weekly or Annual, if it were to be done on the first day of the week, 'tis manifest that the first day of the week was then observed.

But further to satisfy you that it is not an Annual, but a Weekly Collection; you may consider the words *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας*, just in the same form with that Act. 2. 46. they continued in the temple *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας* daily, every day, or day by day; and breaking bread *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας* (domestication) from house to house; and ver. 47. and the Lord added to the Church *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας* daily, such as should be saved. And to the same purpose Act. 5. 42. *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ* daily in the Temple, *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας* and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ. And in the Lords Prayer Luk. 11. 3. Give us our daily bread *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας* day by day: And Act. 13. 27. the voices of the Prophets which are read *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας* every Sabbath-day; and Act. 14. 23. they ordained elders *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας* in every Church; Act. 15. 21. Moses of old hath them that preach him *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας* in every City, being read in the synagogues *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας* every Sabbath.

bath-day; and *Act. 17. 17.* *καὶ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν* daily, or every day: and *Act. 18. 4.* *καὶ πᾶν σάββατον* every sabbath; and *Act. 19. 9.* disputing in the school of one *Tyrannus* καθ' ἡμέραν daily, or day by day; (the same with *καὶ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν* *Act. 17. 17.*) and *Tit. 1. 5.* ordain elders *καὶ πόλιν* in every city: So here, *καὶ μίαν σάββατον*, is on every first day of the week, (week by week.) Would you have it to be rendered, on every One day of the week? And if it were to be done (on that day) week by week, then was this first day, not onely observed, but wont to be observed. Which shews this (as was noted before) not onely to be a single precedent, but a wonted custome; both in the Church of Corinth, and those in Galatia.

You add *Rep. p. 37.* If weekly observed, and wont to be observed, (which you do not deny, though you are loth to grant it,) yet it is not said to be observed as a Sabbath, or as a weekly day of holy Rest. But if hence it appear that it was wont to be observed, (which is not denied,) how it was observed, will appear elsewhere, in religious exercises, of which a charitable collection for the Saints (in want) is one. As they had, before, been forward; so he doth here exhort them (*2. Cor. 9.*) to Continue, and to do it Bountifully; for 'twas a thing to be done more than once; and that first day more than Once to be celebrated.

But it could not (you say) be a Sabbath or Weekly rest, but the quite contrary, for it includes casting up their accounts, telling their money, reckoning their Stock &c. else how can they discreetly lay aside, As God hath prospered them? *Enq. p. 59. Rep. p. 37.* Now because I am here blamed for calling this a Wise Objection, I will call it so no more. But you may find it fully answered *Disc. p. 39.* (though you please to take no notice of it.) And that the same objection lies as well against *Deut. 16. 10.* where on the Feast of Pentecost (which your self call a Sabbath) they are to bring a tribute of a free-will-offering—according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee. Must they therefore on that day cast up their accounts, tell their money, &c. because they were to offer according as the Lord had blessed them? I think not; no more than upon a Sabbath-day. For, that day was to be observed as such, *Levit. 23. 21.* Ye shall proclaim on the self-same day that it may be a Holy Convocation unto you, ye shall do no servile work therein: And it is a branch of the general order, *ver. 2.* and *ver. 4.* concerning all the Feasts there named, that they were to be proclaimed to be Holy Convocations: Of which the Sabbath is one *ver. 3.* and this of Pentecost another, *ver. 15, 16, 21.* If it were not then inconsistent with the (Sabbatical) feast of Pentecost, to offer according as the Lord had blessed them; why should it be thought inconsistent

sistent with a Religious Observance, of the First day of the Week, at Corinth or in Galatia, to lay by as God hath prospered them; without casting up their accounts, telling their money, examining their stock, computing their expenses &c? All which may as well be done before (if need be) in the one case as in the other. As to what you say, this laying by him in store might be done when they were asunder and at home, and not a publick collection. Be it so; but if this be recommended to be done on the First day of the week, (whether publick or private) it is a sign the day however was observed, and presumed to be so. But you might have seen *ver. 1.* it was a Collection for the Saints (not a private laying aside) and *ver. 2.* that there be no Gatherings when I come, which yet must have been if (before) they onely laid aside in private.

I have now shewed you Five precedents, of the First day of the week then observed; and some of them are more than single precedents: (and cleared them from all your Objections.) The first is that of Christ himself, with the two Disciples at Emmaus, and then with the Eleven at Jerusalem, on the day of his Resurrection; and a great deal of serious business there dispatched. A second, of Christ also with his Disciples, on the same day the next week, and in like manner employed. A third, on the day of Pentecost, in the Miraculous Effusion of the Holy-Ghost; and Peter's preaching, to a great Assembly, converting three thousand Souls. A fourth is that of Paul at Troas, *Act. 20.* Preaching to a large congregation, and Celebrating the Lords Supper, on the first day of the week. A fifth is that of *1 Cor. 16.* where Paul (presuming or taking for granted that such were) directs farther, what (amongst other things) he would have to be done at those Meetings, on that day. But if, after all this, you cannot believe (or will not believe) that the first day of the week, was generally observed, or wont to be observed, or at all observed (as you tell us *Rep. p. 38.*) I cannot help it. If you could shew but half so much evidence (or even less than so) from matter of fact, for Mans observing the Seventh-day-sabbath (after Gods resting *Gen. 2.*) before that of *Exod. 16.* (after Israels coming out Egypt,) for more than two thousand and five hundred years: you would think that matter of fact to be well proved.

If the Reader shall think it irksome, that I am put upon disputing so many Little things (I must not call them Trifles) I cannot help it: For, how little soever they are, you think them to be great matters.

A Sixth precedent is that *Rev. 1. 10. I was in the Spirit on the Lords day.* Where though we have it by a *new Name*, it is the *same day* with what is otherwise called the *first day of the Week*; and hath always been so reputed.

This you do not deny to be a good Precedent, if this *Lords day* were the *first day of the Week*.

Now that it was so, (not, as you would have it, the Seventh-day-Sabbath,) I proved to you so fully, *Disc. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50.* as would satisfy any person not strongly pre-engaged. That it was the *proper name of a day* (by which it then was known) you grant *Rep. 39.* And that it was *not the Seventh-day-sabbath* (but some day contradistinguished from it) seems plain, else he would have called it the *sabbath* (the most known name of that day if there were no other Sabbath) *I was in the Spirit on the Sabbath day.* Ignatius who was a *Disciple of St. John* (and so most likely to know his meaning) who wrote soon after (if not before) *St. John* wrote the *Revelations* (for he died within ten years after it) tells us it was the *first day*, in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath (*non amplius Sabbatizantes, sed secundum Dominicam viventes, (seu vitam agentes), in qua & vita nostra orta est;*) not any longer observing the Jews Sabbath, but the *Lords-Day on which Christ our Life rose again.* Exhorting the Christians not to Judaize (*Si enim usque nunc secundum Judaismum vivimus, confitemur gratiam non recepisse*) For if we do yet Judaize, we renounce Grace. And Polycarp (another of *St. John's* disciples) was of the same mind with Ignatius, who collected and published the Epistles of Ignatius, with one of his own. And Justin Martyr (who was Contemporary with them, though not a Christian till some time after) makes it to be our *Sunday*. Yet these were none of the *Romish World* (as you speak *Rep. 59.*) but *Greek Fathers*, and older than the *Romish Corruptions*, or the *Romish Usurpations*, (though not older than the *Church of the Romans* to whom *St. Paul* wrote;) For that *Headship of Rome*, you tell us *Eng. p. 125.* seems not assumed in divers Centuries after the Second Century. And therefore this, not originally from the Romanists (as you fancy *Eng. p. 5.*) nor did they take it from what you call *Romish Traditions*. And it is so taken in the *Fathers, Councils, and Church History* all along to this day. To which your Answer is, These are but *Traditions*, there is or can be no certainty from them, *Rep. p. 39, 40.* (So that all *History* is but *Tradition*.) But pray how shall we know that *Rome* mentioned in the *New Testament* is the same with what we now call *Rome* (and which hath been so called ever since) otherwise than by such *Tradition*? And how can you tell whether our *Satur-day*

day or *Sunday* be the same days (in a continued Succession of Jewish Weeks) with what they called the *seventh* and *first* days, otherwise than by *Tradition*? and (which is more) *Unwritten Tradition*? You tell us *Rep. p. 3.* All the Christian and Hebrew Churches in the world are agreed that *Sunday* is the *First day of the Week* (meaning, I suppose, of the Jewish Week;) Now is this any other than *Tradition*? even *Unwritten Tradition*? And you had told us before, *Eng. p. 78.* that otherwise all the Jews and Christians hitherto in the World are out in their reckoning: Which is nothing but *Tradition*; which you despise. And *pag. 93.* that (in the fifth Century) All Christians in the world did agree which was the Sabbath-day (meaning, the Jewish Sabbath) and which the first day of the week (but it was by a common Tradition they did so agree;) And you add, they all agreed to call the *Seventh day of the Week* the *Sabbath day* (meaning the Jewish Sabbath) but you should have added also, and to call the *first day of the Week*, the *Lords-day*: But it was by equal Tradition, they did so agree. And by like tradition (from the fifth Century downwards till now) we so reckon to this day; but still it is but Tradition. And if (as you tell us *Rep. 39, 40.*) there be no certainty in such Traditions, then are we not certain of either; but, if there be, then are we equally certain of both. And when you tell us *Rep. p. 10.* they were taught it down along from Adam in gracious families from Father to Son; (which was the Seventh-day in course from the Creation): If this were so. (which I can hardly believe) yet still this is Tradition, and no more. And what you add *Rep. p. 74.* that the certain Seventh-day (in course from the first creation,) was preserved by all Nations, *Worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*: is so weak, that there is not the least footstep in History, Sacred or Profane (that I can find) that any nation (much less all nations) did Worship the Sun upon Sunday more than on any other day, or that any nation (before Israel's coming out of Egypt) had any Weeks at all; nor any after that time, but the Jews only, before the times of Christianity; or that the names of *Saturday, Sunday, Monday, &c.* were so much as known before that time: And if any of the Heathen had any Weeks before that time, how shall we know that they were in an uninterrupted circulation from the first Creation: So that all this is not so much as Tradition, but a meer *Pansy*. 'Tis true that, since Christ's time, upon planting the Gospel all the World over, and (with it) the Observation of the *Lords day*, we may reasonably depend upon the *Common Tradition* (which if one Nation should mistake or forget, would soon be rectified by neighbour Nations) but when (by your own concessions) no other Na-

tion in the World did observe the Jewish Sabbath (nor, that we know of, any Week at all,) the case is far otherwise. Nor is it any where said in Scripture, that the Jewish Sabbath (from the first raining of *Manna*) was a *Seventh* day in course from the Creation.

I remember, you tell us *Eng.* p. 117, 118. and you mind me of it *Rep.* p. 40, 75. that *I say nothing to it* (being, it seems, a thing on which you lay great weight,) that *in the Records of Parliament and of the Courts at Westminster, Saturday is called Sabbati, or dies Sabbati (the Sabbath-day).* True, (as supposing, by Tradition, this day of our week to be what the Jews called the Sabbath in their week.) But do not you know also, that (in the same Records) *Sunday* is called (*Dies Dominicus*) the *Lord's-day*? And if those prove *Saturday* to be the Jewish Sabbath, why should not these as well prove *Sunday* to be the *Lord's-day*? All the difference is, as to that you were Quick-sighted, but Blind as to this. You may observe also (if that may be thought material) that the one is *Sabbati* or *dies Sabbati* (in the Genitive case, in the same form with *dies Saturni*, and as the other days are,) but the *Lord's-day* is *die Dominico* (in the Ablative) meaning (I suppose) that *Saturday* is the day on which *had been* the Jewish Sabbath; but this, the day *which is* the *Lord's-day*. Which different Construction seems plainly to intend (in our Law) a different import of the words. By *dies Saturni*, or *dies Lune*, we do not mean, a day *Instituted* by *Saturn* or the *Moon*, as by *dies Dominicus* we do mean, the day *Instituted* by our Lord, (like as by *Cæna Dominica*, we mean, the Supper *Instituted* by our Lord.) So that these *Records* do you no service at all, but Dis-service.

You tell us *Eng.* p. 64. that *the Seventh-day-sabbath was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by him was blessed and sanctified; and that day which the Lord blessed and sanctified is the Lord's day; That he that blessed it was the Lord Christ; And p. 65. The Seventh-day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God Exod. 20. and Deut. 5. and that which is the Lords-Sabbath is the Lords-day. That II. 58. the Lord calls it my holy-day; and it cannot be the less his day because it is his Holy-day; and if it be His day it is the Lords-day. And p. 66. that the Son of Man (the Lord Jesus Christ) is Lord of the Sabbath-day; and that day whereof Christ is Lord, is the Lords-day. And p. 67. Christ, who gave the Sabbath was and is Lord of it. And p. 68. Christ, as Lord of the Sabbath, who gave it, perfectly understood his Own Law. And to the same purpose *Rep.* p. 39, 40. and elsewhere.*

Now this puts us upon another Digression (which may take us up some time) In what consideration our Lord Jesus Christ may be

said

aid to have *Created the World*, to have *Rested* the Seventh day and *blessed it*, to have *given the Law* upon Mount Sinai, and the like.

You may remember that I did formerly distinguish between what Christ did as *God* (in Union with the Father and Holy-Ghost) and what he did (separately) as our *Lord Jesus Christ* (God and Man, as our Mediator, and Founder of the Christian Religion;) and that the *Lord our God* in the Old Testament, doth not signify just the same as our *Lord Jesus Christ* in the New Testament. And I told you *Disc.* p. 2, 3. *I do agree, that our Lord Jesus Christ (according to his Divinity) is God, the true God, the God that made Heaven and Earth, the God who delivered the Law upon Mount Sinai: But I cannot agree that Christ as God and Man (in contradistinction to the Father and Holy-Ghost) did these things; For he was not then Man.*

Now this you take heinously *Rep.* p. 4. (that I should thus distinguish) and you think the Doctor blamable, for so distinguishing. And why so? Are we not to distinguish between what Christ doth as *God*, (in common with the Father and Holy-Ghost) and what he doth as *Mediator*, God and Man? Yes. Where then is the fault? May not I speak *Distinctly* (to avoid mistakes) because you had spoken *Suspiciously*? *It insinuates* (you say) *as if you had said, that Christ as God and Man did all those things; (If your own words do not so insinuate, I did not; nor said any such thing;) whereas you neither said nor ever thought, that Christ was incarnate at the making of the World, or at his giving the Law at Mount Sinai: (Why his giving the Law, rather than Gods giving the Law?) So as the Doctor hath not well furnished in this: And again, Neither I nor any other that I know (say you) has said or thought that Christ when He blessed the Seventh-day (Why when He blessed, rather than, when God blessed?) was then in the Flesh, so that in this I think the Doctor blamable. And yet a third time, p. 5. For the Doctor to impose upon his Reader herein as he doth (you say) seems blamable; and such Artifices (you say) the Reader may discern afterwards. And, I pray, why all this? Did I charge you with having said or thought that Christ was incarnate at God's making of the World, or at God's giving the Law at Sinai? I believe that (when you consider of it) you do not think he was: But if your language were inconsiderate, that was not my fault. I only explained in what sense I can agree to what you said (that our Lord Jesus made the World, and gave the Law upon Mount Sinai;) If your sense be the same with mine, why do you quarrel with my speaking plainly, what you meant? If it be not the same, 'tis You be blamable, not I. You might as well (without all this sourness) have said, You meant no more, but as I do.*

H

But

But the Doctor (you say p. 5.) herein seems to follow Mr. Tros. If so; I know no hurt in it. But 'tis your mistake; For what I say there, was written (and printed too) a good while before I had seen Mr. Tros's book, or knew any thing of it. For though Mr. Tros's book came out, a little before mine was quite finished; the greatest part of mine was printed before his came out. And if Mr. Tros have pressed this more closely upon you than I have done: You must blame your self for it; when all along you take pleasure to attribute to our Lord Jesus Christ (as if with that Reduplication,) which was more properly to be said of God indefinitely. If I (because the Holy-Ghost is God) should affect to say, *In the beginning the Holy Ghost created the Heavens and the Earth;* and, *The Holy-Ghost said, Let there be Light;* and, *The Holy-Ghost said, Let us make Man after our image;* and, *The Holy-Ghost rested the seventh-day;* and, *The Holy-Ghost said, I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other God but me;* (as if no Person but the Holy-Ghost might be owned for God;) Would not this look like an odd Affectation? Yet at this rate you speak all along, affecting to say *Our Lord Jesus Christ* where it were more proper to say *God*. Thus here, The Sabbath-day was instituted *by our Lord Jesus Christ;* and *by him blessed:* He that blessed it was *the Lord Christ;* and the like. Whereas this was not done by him *singly,* nor by him *as Christ,* but by him *as God,* and *jointly* with the Father and Holy-Ghost. And to what purpose is it said, *He that blessed it was the Lord Christ?* when this adds no new authority to the Law more than if it had been said *God blessed it* (Father Son and Holy-Ghost;) for we are no more to break the Law of God, than the Law of our Lord Jesus Christ. And though you sometimes admit *the Father and Holy-Ghost* as sharers herein; yet you say, 'tis *Eminently Christ* Enq. p. 11. And *Christ* you understand as *Principal Efficient of all things in Heaven and Earth,* to whom the Creation is *Eminently and Particularly ascribed;* and (you think) *Eminently spoken of Christ,* p. 6. and again, (in the same page) you do not exclude (you say) *the Father* from this work, nor *the Holy-Ghost,* but say it is *Eminently ascribed to the Lord Jesus Christ,* p. 6. and they *Specially point at Christ* p. 12. and *the Commands given by Christ the Mediator,* p. 13. and *the God of Israel who gave the Law was and is Jehovah the Son,* p. 13.

Now I can allow it proper enough to say that *Christ* (as to his Divinity) is *the God who made the World* (for Father Son and Holy Ghost are the same God,) but it seems hard to say (conversely) that *the Father Son and Holy-Ghost* (who jointly made the World) are *Jehovah the Son.* *The Father, Son and Holy-Ghost made the World;* there-

therefore *He that made the World* (suppose the Father, or Holy-Ghost) is *the Lord Jesus Christ,* will not follow; but only that *One of those who (jointly) made the World is the Lord Jesus Christ.*

I thought you might have learned so much Grammar at School, as to know that *an abstray* doth not signify *one of the Sabbaths;* and so much Logick at the University as to know that *an Universal Affirmative* is not to be Converted *simpliciter;* as well as so much Law at Westminster, as to know that (in the Records of Parliament) *dies Dominicus,* or *the Lord's-day,* commonly called *Sunday,* doth not signify *Saturday;* and that a *midnight-day* (as you wittily call it) that is, *from midnight to midnight,* is no Absurdity, but good Law in Westminster-hall. I am told that in *Rome and Italy* they do reckon as you would have it, from Sunset to Sunset; beginning, from Sunset to reckon, *One, Two, Three a-clock;* and so onward to *Four and Twenty a-clock* at Sunset the next day, (so that *mid day* is, with them, sometimes *sixteen a-clock,* and sometimes *twenty a-clock,* according as the days be long or short;) and I think it is *there only* that men do so reckon. Should I now Reproach your way of reckoning (from Sunset to Sunset) as *Romish, Popish, Monkish, Romish Tradition,* the *Romish World,* the *Men of Rome,* *Rome and its followers?* You own that *Heathenish Rome* in our Saviours time, (as well as *Christian England* now) did reckon from Midnight to Midnight; and it was not, till *some ages after,* that *Popish, Monkish, Anti-Christian Rome* did assume this (*Jewish*) Reckoning: And would you not think it a doughty Argument if I should thus argue against your *Evening-day?* But I go on.

*They seem* (you say) *Especially to refer to Jehovah the Son* p. 14. *We have here the Lord Jesus Christ who made the World, resting on the Seventh day, blessing and sanctifying of it, that is giving the Institution of it, &c.* p. 23. (and why not as well, *God* who made the World, &c.) and this recorded for the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, (why not as well, for the glory of *God?*) and again (in the same page) *the Lord Jesus Christ made the World* (and did not *God the Father* as well?) *He rested on the seventh day, He sanctified it, and so instituted it, and to this institution you think do refer the words of our Lord, The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath; He instituted it &c.* What? He more than the Father and Holy-Ghost? Or did he, as *Son of Man,* institute it? I do not think (though it seems you do) that these words refer to the *Son of Man's Institution,* but rather to his power of *Abolition* of the Jewish Sabbath which was soon after to follow,) For they are spoken by way of *Derogation* not of *Confirmation* of it. Again, *The Ten Commandments were spoken by*

Christ Eminently p. 24. After the promulgation of the Law by Christ at Mount Sinai p. 26. That Christ spake the Ten Commandments p. 29. The Lord rested in heaven and his body in the grave upon His Own instituted Seventh day p. 42. He (Mr. Chasie) though you hope he was a very Good, as well as a Learned man, seems (you say) not to have had clear Apprehensions of Christ, as Creating the world, and then Resting; nor of Christ as Instituting the Sabbath Gen. 2. 2, 3. nor of Christ's confirming the Moral Law at Sinai, Exod. 20. p. 65. (Yet, I presume, he had clear apprehensions of his being God all that time.) So p. 67. Christ who gave the Sabbath, and p. 78. Christ who gave it. The Seventh day which Christ rested upon after the Creation. p. 75. The Seventh day (in the heart of the fourth commandment) is secured by Christ, p. 77. The first Sabbath Gen. 2. ordained by Christ p. 77. Obedience to Christ's ten commandments p. 81. Conformity to the Laws of Christ, that is the Ten Commandments, p. 81. To Christ's laws, that is, to the ten Commandments p. 82. The law our Lord hath given us in the ten commandments, p. 82. That authority which first commanded it, which was Our Lord himself p. 85. Who but Christ hath power to institute a Sabbath-day? p. 86. Who is bound to observe a day not instituted by Christ in scripture? or to lay aside what He hath there Instituted? p. 86. One of Christ's commands p. 91. Christ can vindicate His commandments p. 113. The world was made by our Lord Jesus Christ p. 136. He is the Lord Jehovah who after the Creation instituted the Seventh day, rested on it, sanctified and blessed it. p. 136. At Mount Sinai the Commands were given, by Christ the Redeemer, to Jews and Gentiles. p. 137.

Now when, in all these places (and many more) it were more proper to say God indefinitely, than the Lord Jesus Christ, and yet you affect all along to apply the Creation of the World, the Institution of the Sabbath, the giving of the Law upon Mount Sinai, singly to our Lord Jesus Christ, and to him as our Mediator, and our Redeemer, and to him Eminently and Especially (in contradistinction to the Father and Holy-Ghost;) I had reason to say (Disc. p. 3.) you seemed to lay great stress upon it (at which Rep. p. 4. you are offended) else why should you affect all along to speak, where there was no reason for it, and where the word God would have served your turn as well? I see no reason (as you speak Rep. p. 5.) why you should (affect to) vary from the Scriptures Expressions.

Nor do I see any cause why you should be so highly offended, that I should (without any reflection upon you) Explain what I meant, and what I hoped you had meant (or should have meant) though your Expressions were justly exceptionable.

I add

I add further; Though you now tell us, You did not say nor think that Christ was incarnate at the making of the World (and I believe, when you consider of it, you do not think he was); yet you do not retract your saying, That Our Lord Jesus Christ did, as our Mediator and Redeemer, create the World &c, and that (as such) he did it Eminently and Especially (in contradistinction to the Father and Holy-Ghost) and that Jehovah who made the World, is the Lord Jesus Christ. Which I do not think to be safe expressions.

Nor have you any reason to charge me (as Rep. p. 5.) with Insinuations against the Deity of Christ: (And I presume you do not suspect me as to that point, whatever you please here to insinuate.) Shall I return you your own words which there follow, Why you should thus begin in a case which relates to the Deity of Christ with such insinuations (as if I would derogate from it) for which you have no colour from my Discourse, unless it were to infuse some Prejudice, I am not willing to conjecture? Must all be thought enemies to the Deity of Christ, who do not approve of your Saturday-sabbath?

I do own that the Divine Person called in Scripture *ὁ λόγος* the Word, and the Son of God (or God the Son) was from all Eternity with God and was God (and is God) and did (in Union with the Father and Holy-Ghost) make the World; and that the same Divine Person (remaining the same Person) was (afterwards) incarnate, and did (as God and Man) become our Mediator and Redeemer, and (as such) is commonly designed by the title of our Lord Jesus Christ; But I do not know that as such he made the World, (for there is one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. 2. 5.) Nor do I know that he did enter upon the Execution of his Mediatorial Office, or the work of Redemption, before he was the Seed of the Woman, that is, before he became Man. 'Tis true it was before Designed, and by God Decreed, and the Effect of it did look backward to those before Christ; but the Execution (of what was before decreed) was after he became Man; not before the Creation of the World. And what you allege from Eph. 1. 2, 3, 4. the Father hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, is nothing to the purpose; for though we were chosen before the foundation of the world to be in him, and that we should be holy, &c. yet it was not decreed that we should be before the foundation of the World, or that we should be holy before the foundation of the World; and ver. 5. having Predestinated us to the Adoption of Children by Jesus Christ; our Predestination was before, but our Adoption by Jesus Christ was after. Nor was there any Occasion of such Mediator or Redeemer till the Fall of Man; but the Creation of the World was

(I

(I think) before the Fall; and therefore not created by Christ as Mediator; but by that Divine Person (in Union with the Father and Holy-Ghost) who afterward became Man, and was our Redeemer and Mediator. And if the Creation be more Eminently to be ascribed to one of the three Persons rather than the other, I should choose to ascribe it to the Father (rather than Eminently to the Son) because in our Creed we say *I believe in God the Father Almighty Maker of Heaven and Earth; and in Jesus Christ His only Son &c.* And we do use to distinguish between *God the Creator and Christ the Redeemer.*

Yet I did not reproach you for saying that *God who created the World* (Father Son and Holy-Ghost) is *Our Lord Jesus Christ*; (I only explained what I meant; and if you mean so too, there is no hurt in it.) As neither did I reproach you for divers other unsafe Expressions: As when you tell us *Love is the Essence of God*, Enq. p. 15. which I should not have said. I know 'tis said that *God is Love*, (1 Job. 4. 8, 16.) that is, a *Loving God*, or a *very Loving God*; and therefore I would say that *Love is a Divine Attribute*, or (if you will) an *Essential Attribute* (resulting from Gods Essence and inseparable from it;) and so is *Hatred and Wrath* (for God doth as well *Hate Evil* as he *Loves Good*; and is as well *Angry with Sin*, as *Pleased with Duty*;) yet I would not say that *Hatred and Wrath are Gods Essence*. And you tell us again (in the same page) that *Truth is Gods Essence*. I know it is said that *God is a God of Truth* Deut. 32. 4. *Isai. 65. 16.* (and cannot Ly,) and *The Spirit is Truth* (1 Job. 5. 6.) that is, what the Spirit testifies is True: Yet I would not therefore say that *Truth is Gods Essence* (though Truth in God be an Essential Attribute:) For it is said also that *God is a Jealous God*, yet I should think it a bold expression (and justly blamable) to say that *Jealousy is Gods Essence*. Nor would I say (as p. 30.) because *God is Light and in him is no darkness* 1 Joh. 1. 5. therefore *Light is the Essence of God*: For 'tis said also *Our God is a consuming fire*, Heb. 12. 29. Deut. 4. 24. yet I should think it a very unfavoury expression to say, a *consuming fire is Gods Essence*. We say indeed that Gods Attributes are not things Really distinct (*ut res & res*, as the Schools speak) but *Modally* at most, (or rather not so much, but only *ratione ratiocinata*,) yet I would not therefore say that *Love is the Essence of God*, or that *Hatred is the Essence of God*, however *Essential* to God; as inseparable from his Essence.

To return therefore from this Digression, and apply it to our present business; *The Sabbath of the Lord our God*, (who made

Heaven

Heaven and Earth and rested the Seventh day) is no proof that the *Lords day* in the New Testament (that is, the day of our Lord Jesus Christ, the founder of our Christian Religion) is the *Seventh day of the Jewish Week*. For by the *Lord* (Jehovah) in the Old Testament, is meant *God* indefinitely (with joint respect to Father Son and Holy-Ghost;) but the *Lord* (ὁ κύριος) in the New Testament is usually meant of *Our Lord Jesus Christ* (as you cannot but know;) and *πρὸς τὸν κύριον* the *Cup of the Lord*, *τραπέζα κυρίου* the *Lords Table*, and *δείπνον κυρίου* the *Lords Supper*, 1 Cor. 10. 21. Cor. 11. 20, 27. are distinctly meant (and you know them so to be) of the *Cup*, the *Table*, the *Supper* of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, appointed by him as the Founder of our Christian Religion; And accordingly *κύριος κυρίου* (just in the same form) the *Lords Day*, is the day of our *Lord Jesus Christ* as by him appointed. And to play upon the ambiguity of the Word *Lord* (which sometimes signifies the *Lord God*, and sometimes the *Lord Christ*) is but loose arguing, and fallacious Disputation. Yet this is all you pretend, for proving that *κύριος κυρίου* the *Lords day* Rev. 1. 10. is the *Seventh-day-sabbath* of the Jewish Week. You do not shew that any where that day was ever called *κύριος κυρίου*, or that *κύριος κυρίου* doth any where signify other than our *dies dominicus* with particular respect to our Lord Christ; nor do in your Reply add any new strength to your old Argument, to take off this Answer which I gave to it.

But further yet: If *κύριος κυρίου* the *Lords day*, *dies dominicus*, be the *Seventh-day-sabbath*, as you would have it: Why do you find fault with us for observing that day? The day which we observe as the *Christian Sabbath* is the *dies dominicus*, and we keep it by that name, and by that name it hath been kept from the Apostles days downward till now, and in a continual Succession from that day which is so called in Rev. 1. 10. Which, whether it be the first day or the seventh day of the Jewish Week, this is the day we keep. We think it to be the first day, and you say 'tis the seventh day, but however it is *dies dominicus*; and your Records (to which you appeal) do no more prove that *dies sabbati* is in a continual succession from the Jewish *sabbath*, than that *dies dominicus* (in the same records) is in continual succession from the Apostles *Lords day*. You say, We have nothing but *Tradition* for the One; You have nothing but *Tradition* for the other; for there is no man now living, that can remember either.

I should now have done with this point but that I am called upon Rep. p. 40. and again Rep. p. 75. to answer your Collections for the *Seventh*

*Seventh day* in Derogation to the *Dominical day*, as you call it.

But why must *dies Dominicus* (for so, I presume you find it in the Latine from whence these Collections are made) be all along translated *the Dominical day*, rather than *the Lords day*? Is not *dies dominicus*, in plain English, *the Lords day*, as much as *cena dominica* is *the Lords Supper*, and *oratio dominica*, *the Lords Prayer*? I find you can say, without scruple, *the Lords Supper*, and *the Lords Prayer*, and why not as well *the Lords day*, but it must be forsooth *the Dominical day*? Would it not be thought an odd Humour in me, if I should affect all along to say *the Dominical Cane* and *the Dominical Orison* for what others in plain English call *the Lords Supper*, and *the Lords Prayer*? And why then must it be with you *the Dominical day*? Is it because you think *Dominical*, a Finical word? Or, because you would amuse your English Reader to make him think that *the Dominical day* doth signify somewhat other than *the Lords day*? You mind me sometimes of the *Records in Parliament*; but you may remember also that what in those Records is called *dies Dominicus* in Latine is in the same Records (and Acts of Parliament) called, in English, *the Lords day commonly called Sunday*. However, I know no great hurt in the word *Dominical* (as to those that understand Latine) save that it is a needeleſſ Affeſſation: And, as for those English Readers who do not underſtand Latine, I would tell them that *the Dominical day* is in plain English *the Lords day*, however you may please to diſguise it with a hard Word.

This Collection is a work, it ſeems, of ſome years (in ſeveral times and in ſeveral places, and for divers years, Enq. p. 120. though with interruptions,) to which, you ſay, *the Doſtor ſays nothing*, and to which *the Doſtor answers not*. 'Tis true I did not ſay much to it, becauſe I thought it not to need an Answer, and was contented to truſt the Reader with it.

But ſince you call upon me to answer it, I have looked it over again, and though I am ſtill of the ſame mind, yet ſhall comply with you therein.

The queſtion we are now upon, is, whether the *Dominical Day* have been all along obſerved; and what you have to ſay againſt it in theſe Collections: for ſhewing *When the obſervation of the ſeventh day ended, and when the obſervation of the firſt day began amongſt Chriſtians*, Enq. pag. 85. But if you admit that the obſervation of the *Seventh day ended* when that of the *Firſt day began*, it muſt be very early.

That the *Lords-day* was obſerved very early, not onely by St. John, Rev. 1. 10. but by his Diſciple Ignatius within ten years after

after St. John wrote his Revelation, if not ſooner; and by Polycarp another of St. John's diſciples who collected and published the Epiſtles of Ignatius together with one of his own on that occaſion; and by Juſtin Martyr about twenty years after; and by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and the Fathers, Councils, and Church Hiſtory downwards, was ſhewed before; and I ſuppoſe you will not deny but that there are frequent Teſtimonies of it; onely you would have us ſuppoſe, that all *Hiſtory* is but *Tradition*. But I am now to conſider your Collection. I have not examined your Quotations (nor think it worth the while) but take them as you give them; with your deſcants upon them. But thoſe Deſcants I do not take to be authentick.

Your Collection begins Enq. p. 91. and ends pag. 130 (with many of your Deſcants intermixed.) Wherein you give us (if I do not miſ-reckon) between fifty and threeſcore teſtimonies for the obſervation of the *Lord's day* (or, as you pleaſe to call it, the *Dominical day*.) in the Firſt, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth Century, and ſo downwards. Beſide which you tell us pag. 121. you paſſ by ſome Expreſſions in Hiſtory (how many, you do not tell us) in favour of the *firſt day*, (which 'tis Candid to Confeſs, but Partiality ſo to do.) And you tell us p. 131. *He who will take the pains may find much more in Binius, the Magdeburgenſes, and Eusebius.*

And theſe Teſtimonies for the *Dominical day*, (if your Dates be right) begin very Early, in the *Firſt Century*; that is, I ſuppoſe, before St. John's writing the Revelation. Our Saviour's death was about the 34<sup>th</sup> year of that Century, and St. John wrote his Revelation about the 94<sup>th</sup> or 95<sup>th</sup> year thereof, ſome years before his death: for he lived till within a year or two of the end of that Century.

You tell us p. 96. That in the *firſt Century*, Contentions were ſtirred up about celebrating the Paſſ-over upon the *Dominical day*. And though pag. 123. you mince the matter a little by calling it about the *second or third Century*, yet even there you cite Lucius, Cent. 1. lib. 2. and you there own this *Dominical day* (that is, in plain English, *the Lords day*) to be the *firſt day of the Week*, not the *Jewiſh Sabbath*. Though elſewhere you would have it, that the *Lords day* mentioned by John Rev. 1. 10. is the *ſeventh day Sabbath*, Enq. p. 69. And you inſiſt upon it Rep. p. 39. that the *Lords day* Rev. 1. 10. is not onely the name of a day, but the name of the *Seventh-day Sabbath*. And Enq. p. 69. that 'tis a Stealing-away the *Lords-day* from the *Seventh-day Sabbath*, and giving that name to the *firſt day*: And great endeavours you uſe to perſwade us ſo to think,

Eng. p. 60, to p. 69. and Rep. p. 3, 7, 15. 19. 39, 40. though you confess (Eng. p. 64.) that from the Text or Context you find nothing very considerable to that purpose.

Now what you call about the second or third Century, is (by your own citation) in the first Century, and in all likelihood while St. John was yet alive, and even before he wrote the Revelation.

Yet I will be just to you; Anicetus and Victor (whom you cite as concerned in this business, p. 96.) were Bishops of Rome in the second Century (not in the first;) but the dispute about it was older than so; and p. 124, 125. you cite Pius, to the same purpose, who was before either of those two; And p. 96. (as before) and again p. 123. you own it to have been in the first Century; and cite for it Lucius, Cent. 1. lib. 2. fol. 36. and again Lucius, 1 Cent. lib. 2. fol. 387.

I did not expect that Mr. Bampfield would have furnished us with testimonies so ancient (as in the first century, while some of the Apostles were yet living) for the observation of Easter, (though with some difference about the day) and (at p. 122.) reckon St. Paul amongst those who so observed it.

But when you tell us Eng. p. 123. that some kept Easter on the first day of the week, others on the fourteenth day of the first month, in commemoration of Christs Resurrection; I take this to be a mistake. Those who kept it on the first day of the Week (on which Christ rose) kept it indeed in Commemoration of the Resurrection on that day. But not the Quartadecimani who kept it on the fourteenth day of the month, (whatever day of the week it happened to be.) For this was neither the day of the Week, nor the day of the Month, on which Christ Rose, but on which he Died. And therefore kept it either as a Continuation of the Jewish Pass-over on that day: or as a Commemoration of Christs Death, not of his Resurrection. But this is beside our business, and therefore I pass it.

What you tell us Eng. p. 89. of the point of the Vernal and Autumnal Equinox being just over Paradise; I do not understand (nor, I suppose, do you) nor shall I trouble my self to make sense of it. But will excuse it, as being a thing out of your rode.

Now how soon so ever the controversy did arise about keeping Easter on the Dominical day, so soon at least the Dominical day was understood to be the first day of the (Jewish) week. And when you tell us, Eng. p. 93. that you transcribe these authorities, to shew that all the Christians in the World did agree which was (by Tradition) the Sabbath day and which the First day of the Week (you should have added, and which was the Dominical day) and that they all agreed, you

you say, (but it was by tradition) to call the Seventh day of the week, the Sabbath day; you should have added, and the first day of the week, the Dominical day. You might have observed also that all this for the Sabbath day is but (what you call) Tradition, and the same Tradition is as full for the Dominical day (the Lords day) being the First day of the week. For how came they thus to agree in the fifth Century, the time you cite? Was it not from a presumption that (from Christs time downward) by a continued Tradition from hand to hand the memory of the Seventh day (of the Jewish Week) was preserved, and the memory of the Lords day likewise? And by a like Tradition (and no otherwise) is the same memory preserved from the fifth Century to our Time.

You do not deny therefore, the Dominical day (the Lords day) to have been then observed all along, and by that name, and taken to be the same with the first day of the (Jewish) Week. Which is the thing I was to prove.

But, you tell us, p. 91. that in some places there were publick Assemblies on other days also; (And no doubt but there were; like as now there are publick Assemblies for Prayers and Sermons on week-days, and in some places every day, for those to repair to who have leisure and opportunity of so doing:) And you name the Sabbath, the Dominical day, the second and fourth of the Sabbath (which you take to be Monday and Wednesday) and Parasceven (which you take to be Good Friday, (perhaps others may take it to be every Friday) p. 92, 93, 94, 97, 99. But still you own the Dominical day was one; And then, their meeting also on some other days, doth not gain-say their observing of this day.

You tell us p. 94. and again p. 99. that amongst the days for publick assemblies the Dominical day is mostly named, (as being indeed the chief day so observed,) but amongst some (you say) the day of the Sabbath is found, (but not alone without the Lords day, or instead thereof.) And again The Dominical day was solemn to Christians, but amongst other festivals mention is made of the Sabbath: And yet again, When they did assemble, and how often, is not expressly written but the most mention is made of the Sabbath and of the Dominical day. So still the Lords-day is one, whatever other days be sometimes or somewhere observed.

You own also, p. 97. that of these two days mostly named, the Dominical day was preferred; and that, on the Sabbath day they were not to Judaize but might work, but not on the Dominical day, and this as old at least as the fourth Century, by your own citation. And many such testimonies you give us all along, of not working on the

*Dominical days*, but spending them in *Religious Exercises*. And own that (at least as early as the Twelfth Century) it was called *the Christian Sabbath*, p. 95. Which doth not well agree with what you have pag. 118. where you would have us think it was not so called till by some late writers, within Eighty years or thereabout.

You own also this difference, as high at least as the fourth Century, p. 92, 93. (though at p. 101. you would have us think *this constitution* not to be earlier than the twelfth Century,) between the *Dominical day* and the *Sabbath* (between the *Lords day* and *Saturday*) that *Saturday* was kept as a *Fast* (in memory of Christs lying in the Grave that day) but the *Lords day* as a *Festival* (in memory of Christs Resurrection) p. 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 101, 104, 119. But, *publick Fasting-days* (you tell us p. 93.) were kept holy to God as well as *Festivals*; and there doth appear no great difference whether they Feast or Fast on that day. Surely there is. *The Sabbath* (Lev. 23. 2, 3.) is to be kept as a *Feast of the Lord*; and therefore to Fast on that day, is not to keep *this Sabbath*. You say further, that, some persons and in some places did not fast but dine upon this day. That is, (if I do not misunderstand it) they did not so much as keep it as a *Fast*. But however, the *Lords day* was kept, and kept as a *Festival*.

Some (you tell us p. 109, 110, 111, 114.) did keep their Sabbath from *Saturday noon*, or from *Saturday three a-clock*, till *Sun-rising on Monday morning*. But this makes nothing against the *Lords day*, for that was therein observed intirely, and hedged-in on both sides.

You tell us p. 95. that on the Sabbath day, *William the Conquerour* on the principal Feast had magnificent and sumptuous banquets, which they called a profanation of the Sabbath. But which of the days (the first or the seventh) you cannot certainly say, but Think (you tell us) it was the *Seventh-day-sabbath*. What if I should think it were the *First-day Sabbath*; were not My Thinking as good authority as yours? Since you own p. 95. that, about that time, the *Lords day* was called *the Christian Sabbath*. And I doubt some other of your citations in favour of *Saturday*, may (if well examined) be found to refer to the *Sunday-sabbath*. But I do not trouble myself to examine them.

You tell us, pag. 115, 117, 118, 119, that (in England) we have no Statute made for *Sunday* (that you know of) till that in *Edward the Sixth's time*. But doth that prove the *Lords day* was not till then observed in England? (But you own the *Kings Writs*, and *Order of the Lord Mayor*, to that purpose, older than so.) Do you know

know of any Statute or Act of Parliament (before that time) made against it, or for *Saturday sabbath*? There was no *Imperial Law* (that we know of) older than *Constantine*, for the exercise of the *Christian Religion*; but are we therefore to think it was not practised before that time?

You do not find, you tell us p. 117, by the best collections you can make with your few books, that, for 1200 years or more, they (in England) received the Observation of *Sunday*, (However, this is long before King *Edward the Sixth's time*.) But in the year 1200 you own it p. 115. But do you find that, before that time, they kept their Sabbath on *Saturday*? No: Nor do you find, it seems, whether before that time they did keep any Sabbath at all. You say, they had a weekly day of Rest, (I suppose they had, and that it was the *Lords day* commonly called *Sunday*.) But all the old Records yet extant, even down to this day, you say, do call it (that day of rest) the Sabbath day. I do not know where to find those old records (older than the year 1200) which tell us that *Saturday* was their Weekly day of Rest. It may be true that in old Records (I know not whether so old) and in new ones too, *Saturday* is called *dies Sabbati*, and so it is at this day, (as being the supposed day of the Jewish Sabbath,) Yet, not *Saturday* but the *Lords day* is our weekly day of Rest, and was so (for ought you shew to the contrary) ever since Christianity was received amongst us. You own that, since the year 1200, the *Lords day* hath been received as our weekly day of Rest, and so it is at this day; though *Saturday* is yet called *dies Sabbati*. And when you produce those Records (older than the year 1200,) if therein you find *Saturday* called *dies Sabbati*, I suppose we shall there find *Sunday* called *dies Dominicus*.

You tell us of *Markets* kept on the *Dominical day* p. 116. in the time of King *John* and *Henry the Third*. This perhaps may prove that it was not so well observed as it ought to be; but it doth not prove it not to be at all observed. For this was after the year 1200, when you own the *Lords day* to be received. You tell us *Eng. p. 39, 63, 133.* and elsewhere, in the time of *Nehemiah* (and before the Captivity) of *Markets* kept on the Jewish Sabbath; but doth it thence follow that (because some profaned it) the Jewish Sabbath was not at all observed? In the mean time, were no *Markets* held on *Saturday*? This you should have proved, to have proved a preference of *Saturday-sabbath* to the *Lords day*: (Otherwise, this proves no more for *Saturday-sabbath* than for *Monday sabbath*.) But you shew not a word of this.

You tell us p. 117. (much to the same purpose) out of Mr. Prin, that we find by the Writs to summon Parliaments that they were of old appointed to meet upon Sundays (I suppose you mean, sometimes, not always,) even in the time of Edw. I. Edw. II. Edw. III. which Edw. I. succeeded Hen. III. who succeeded King John. The Successions you reckon right; (But all these are since the year 1200.) Pray do me the favour (next time you examine those Records) to inform me, whether (in those Writs of Summons and in the Records of those Parliaments) the Sunday be not called *dies Dominicus*. For if so, Sunday was then the Lords day, and so reputed, though Parliaments did sometimes meet on those days. And I have the more reason to think so, because even here you call it the Dominical day, which I presume you would not have done if it had not been there *dies Dominicus*.

I remember that in the Reign of King Charles I. (if I were not then mis-informed) they were wont to sit in Privy-Counsel and hear Causes, on Sundays in the afternoon; (whether well or ill I am not now to dispute,) and I have heard the reason assigned, because they could not meet on a better day than when there were solemn Prayers for them in all the Congregations of England. And I have been told (and perhaps you may remember it) that in the late Reigns, it was then usual to play at Cards on Sundays. Shall we thence conclude, the Lords-day was not then observed in England? You know the contrary.

But, you say further, Rich. II. who was deposed (you say) by his Popish rebellious Subjects and Clergy (what's this to the purpose? and on whom is this intended to reflect? on those of 48? or those of 88? or of 60?) who succeeded Edw. III. the Parliament appointed to meet upon Sunday, met that day and adjourned till Monday; From which time Prin says, no Parliaments have been summoned to meet on the Dominical day. (Doth Mr. Prin call it the Dominical day?) I confess I have not examined all the Records to answer this Allegation: But perhaps you may remember that (within our memory) Oliver's Triennial Parliaments were ordered to meet on Sep. 3. whatever day of the week it might happen to be; and that the first of those Triennials did meet on Sunday, Sept. 3. 1654. did then (I think) hear a Sermon, and adjourned till Monday. And you may remember that in the year 1641, the Parliament then sat on a Sunday, and their Printed Votes for that day, bear date *Die Dominico* 8. Aug. 1641. and if you search the Journals of Parliament, for that time, you will find it so. But shall we thence conclude, That, in those years, the Lords day was not observed in England? I should rather

from

from thence conclude (and we know it was so) that it was observed; else their Votes would not have been dated *Die Dominico*.

You tell us several times, that there be some Christians who to this day do observe Saturday, and you tell us p. 120. who those are, the Habissines, or Mid-land Ethiopians (the same people, but by another name.) Purchas, you say, writes of the Habissines, as observing the Saturday Sabbath. What? that day solely, in opposition to the Lords-day? No; but they keep it solemnly equal to the Dominical day, for which you cite Brerewood's Enquiries. And (out of Sandis Travels) they celebrate Saturday (as he calls it) as well as Sunday. You own therefore their Celebration of the Lords-day; and therefore not of Saturday in stead of it, or in Opposition to it.

But you should have told us also (which is a second answer to that Allegation) that the same Habissines do observe Circumcision also; and so do Judaize in more things than one. And when they retain Circumcision (not in opposition to, but) in conjunction with Baptism, no wonder if they retain the Jewish Sabbath together with the Lords-day.

You tell us, p. 119. that the Grecians and their Churches (that is, some of them, not All,) do keep the Saturday Festival, that is (as your self expound it) they eat Flesh on that day, and forbid to Fast on any Saturday except Easter-eve. (For you tell us p. 98. that by Fasting, is meant, Not-Dining; and accordingly, to Dine is your Festival; and so you distinguish it Enq. p. 93. some Dined and some Fasted on the Sabbath day.) But do they not observe the Lords-day? Yes; they celebrate divine service as solemnly on the Sabbath as on the Dominical day. (We are then safe as to this point.) But you need not have gone so far; you might have found those nearer home, who solemnly Celebrate divine service on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays, as well as on the Lords-day; (and in some places, on every day of the week;) But do they therefore not observe the Lords day?

You tells us p. 115. of divers Provinces of Christians, subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Well. But are there any of these Provinces which do not observe the Lords-day? and are you sure they do (all of them) celebrate divine service on Saturday also?

You tell us p. 115. that in the year 1555, there were (you think at Rome) some Sabbatarians; who, it seems, held that the Dominical day was not to be observed; but who are said to be otherwise heretical. But doth it thence follow, that the Lords day was not then observed at Rome? Perhaps it may be said, a hundred year hence, that, about this time, Mr. Bampfield wrote a Book for the

Satur.

*Saturday-Sabbath*; But shall it be thence concluded, that the *Lords-day* is not now generally observed in England? Perhaps it may be said, that at some *Wakes* on the *Lords-day*, there have been *Bull-baitings*, and some other *Profanations*? But must it be thence concluded, the *Lords-day* is not at all celebrated, because there are some who profane it? as there always was, and always will be, as long as there be wicked Men in the world.

You had told us, (much to the same purpose) p. 105. that in the Year 603. some are said to preach by Jewish Superstition or the Grecian Custom, That it was a Duty to worship upon the Sabbath in like wise as upon the Dominical day. There was, it seems (even by those no doubt made of the *Lords-day*, the onely doubt was, whether on *Saturday* also. And the like (for ought appears) might be the sense of your other *Sabbatarians* in 1555. for it is but it seems (as you self cite it) that they were against observing the *Lords-day*; you do not affirm it, or that your Author so says: onely it seems so to you; (because they are called *Sabbatarians*.)

You tell us p. 102. that *Socrates Scholasticus* (in the fourth Century) about the Diversity of Observations in divers places, touching *Easter*, *Fasting*, *Marriage*, *Service*, with other Ecclesiastical Rites, says, Touching the Communion there are sundry Observations and Customs, for though in a manner all Churches throughout the whole World do celebrate and receive the holy Mysteries, (that is, the Communion or *Lords Supper*) every Sabbath day after other (that is, as well on *Saturday*, as on any other day of the Week) yet the People inhabiting *Alexandria* and *Rome*, of an old tradition do not use it, (that is, because, as you tell us elsewhere, they used to Fast upon *Saturday* in memory of Christs lying in the Grave on that day, they did not use on *Saturdays* to have the Communion or *Lords Supper*, as on other days they had, as there was occasion.) And here you run out into a large descant about *Holy Mysteries*; that celebrating and receiving the *Holy Mysteries*, you take to be their publick weekly Assemblies for Preaching, and for Hearing the Gospel preached, for Prayers and Praise, and for Baptism and the *Lords-supper* &c. Now if you will take it so to be, who can can help it? Others I suppose, will take the receiving the *Holy Mysteries* to be the receiving the *Lords-supper* in particular; for you tell us 'tis the variety of Customs touching the Communion. And then you tell us, we have here *Socrates* a learned writer positively affirming all the Churches every where throughout the World, as every week came about, holding their Religious Assemblies, celebrating the Mysteries, i. e. administering Baptism, the *Lords Supper*, Prayer, Preaching, Singing, &c. upon

the Sabbath day, that is the Seventh-day-sabbath, upon every Seventh day after other, except the *Alexandrians* and *Romans*; who then refused to do as all the Christian Churches in the world besides did, (which is your descant, not *Socrates's* words.) And a great Harangue about this we have for the greatest part of two pages, p. 102, 103. and you are at it again and again afterwards. And when all comes to all, it is no more but this, that the Churches of *Rome* and *Alexandria*, (who did, as all other Churches did, observe the *Lords-day*, but did use to Fast upon *Saturday*;) did not use on *Saturday* (their day of fast) to celebrate the *Lords Supper* (as on other days they did, as there was occasion;) whereas other Churches (which did not use to fast on *Saturday*) did (as there was occasion) as well on that day, as any other, celebrate the Communion, from time to time. Surely you will not pretend (out of *Socrates*) that those other Churches did not observe the Dominical day: For that is contrary to your whole Collection. So that all this is but great Cry and little Wool. How doth this prove that they did not observe the *Lords-day*? Which you know they did.

So that of all that we have heard hitherto, there is not one allegation, that I can see, of any people, who (whatever other days they did observe) did not observe the *Lords-day*. But you tell us a long story, with your Descant about it, p. 106. and so onward to p. 116. as if the Observation of the *Lords-day* were not received in *Scotland* till the year 1203. because of a Law then made for that purpose (you think) by the King and Parliament of *Scotland*. Which I take to be much like to what you tell us elsewhere, p. 115, 117. of no Law for it in *England* by the King and Parliament till *Edward the Sixth's* time.) And would have it thought, that, till then, the *Saturday-Sabbath* was there observed. But this is to beg what you were to prove. If they did not till then receive the *Lords-day* (which I do not believe,) you should have proved that they observed (before that time) any Sabbath at all. But, in all your long Story, I do not find one word to that purpose. So that (for ought appears) the question was not between *Saturday-sabbath*, and *Sunday-sabbath*; but between Sabbath and No-sabbath. And you think this an honour to them that they were the last in this part of the World, which admitted the First day, p. 111, 113. I do not take to be at all an honour, that till then they had no Sabbath at all. I do not doubt, for my own part, but that when they first received Christianity, they did with it (as other nations did) receive the *Lords-day*. For whether Christianity were in *Scotland* first planted by the Western Teachers, or (as you think p. 123.) by the Grecians, the *Lords-day* was observed by both: for though

they differed as to the point of *Easter*, (not whether it should be observed or no, but on what day it should be observed) they did not differ as to the *Lords-day*; but both agreed, as well that it should be observed, as on what day. And from whether soever of the two, the *Scots* received their *Christianity*, from the same (I doubt not) they received also the Observation of the *Lords-day*, which was common to both.

But I do not think it strange at all, considering the temper of mankind, (who are naturally more intent on things of this world, than on matters of Religion,) that they might by degrees grow remiss in it, and the thing be much neglected (as was the Jewish Sabbath in *Nebemiah's* time and long before.) And even where it is established by Law, there is frequent occasion of new laws to enforce and revive the old ones from time to time: As in *England* (we find) it hath been.

And this I suppose was the case of *Scotland* at that time, and perhaps of *England* too; that is, the *Lords-day* being too much neglected, and perhaps in some places disused, needed a new Law for the better observation of it; as was in *Nebemiah's* time for the Jewish Sabbath. But to think that the *Saturday-sabbath* had been till then observed, and now to be chang'd for the *Lords-day*, is a fancy of yours, without any foundation. If you would from hence prove any thing to the purpose, you should have shewed that, before that time, they had observed the Jewish Sabbath. But of this, here is not the least intimation in all that you produce.

I have now consider'd your *Collection* (because you thought it of concernment that I should so do,) and have done it fairly, taking it just as you give it us, without so much as consulting any of the Books which you cite (to see how fairly you have translated and represented what there you find:) which Books, if I had consulted, I doubt not but I might there have met with much in derogation of what you would thence persuade us.

So that, upon the whole matter, there is nothing appears in your whole *Collection*, but that where any Sabbath (or day of Holy Rest) was at all kept amongst Christians, the *Lords-day* was there observed; and whatever other days were observed also (as many were in many places, and still are,) it was not any where in opposition to the *Lords-day*, but in concurrence with it. As, amongst us, there be frequent Week-day Lectures, and publick Prayers, for those to repair to whose occasions and opportunities do permit; and in *Colledges*, *Cathedrals*, and many other Churches and Chapels, every day; but no where in opposition to the *Lords-day*.

It appears also, all along, from your own *Collection*, that from the first Century (in the Apostles time) to this day, *dies Dominicus*, the *Lords-day* (or as you call it the *Dominical day*) is on all hands agreed to signify the first day of the week, in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath.

And whereas you reproach us so often with *Rome*, the *Romans*, the *Roman World*, *Romish Traditions*, &c. (about 120 times or more in your *Enquiry*, and very often, though not so often, in your *Reply*) as if the observation of the *Lords-day*, or as you call it the *Dominical Day*, came onely from *Romish Usurpation* (imposing of Laws upon all the World) 'tis notoriously known that *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus* and others, were none of the *Romish World*, but *Greek Fathers*, and antecedent to the *Romish Usurpation*, which you own, (*Enq.* p. 125) not to be assumed in divers Centuries (divers hundred years) after their time.

'Tis manifest therefore (from your own *Collection*) that the *Lords-day*, was the first day of the week (not the seventh) and so reputed; and known by that name even in the first Century, where the Apostles lived, (and before *St. John* wrote the Revelation,) and hath been so reputed ever since, and as such generally observed by Christians wherever they observed any Sabbath at all: And as you speak *Enq.* p. 93. all Christians in the World did agree, (as well which was the *Lords-day*, as) which was the Sabbath; and if not so, then (as p. 78.) all Christians hitherto in the world must be out of their reckoning, (and to the same purpose *Rep.* p. 3.) which if it be a good argument to prove that our *Saturday* is the Jews Sabbath, proves as well that our *Sunday*, is the *Lords-day*.

But when I say, it hath been generally so observed; I do not mean it of every single person: (For no doubt but that some persons who call themselves Christians, may be so profane as to keep no Sabbath; or so remiss (as you speak *Enq.* p. 117.) as not much at all: And that some others may have had some peculiar Whimsies of their own:) But no Church, or Society of Christians (that we know of) who kept any Sabbath at all, who did not observe the *Lords-day*.

I have now done with that point (and shewed, I think, sufficiently) that the *Lords-day*, *Rev.* 1.10. is (as our *Records* and *Acts of Parliament* call it) the *Lords-day*, commonly called *Sunday*.

And I shall here conclude that first point, to warrant our Observation of that day, from those Many and Great Precedents that we have of such Observation, by Christ and his Apostles, and the

Christian Churches, both in that age, and ever since.

By the Example of Christ, who on the day of his *Resurrection* (which is by all agreed to be *the first day of the week*) Preaching that doctrine to the *Women* who came to the Sepulcher, and then to the *two disciples* going to *Emmaus*, and Celebrating the *Lords Supper* with them; and afterwards assembling with his *Disciples* at *Jerusalem*, Preaching to them the same doctrine, Reproving their Unbelief, Confirming their Faith, Blessing their Assembly, Ordaining them to the Office of *Apostles* (who before were *Disciples*) and giving them *Instructions* for Planting the Christian Church in *All Nations*, of Gentiles as well as Jews.

By his *second* assembling with them on the *next Lords day*, having intermitted all the intermediate days, even that of the *Jewish Sabbath*, (as appears *Job. 21. 1, 14.* where when after these things he again shewed himself to them at the *Sea of Tiberias*, 'tis expressly noted, *This is now the Third time that Jesus shewed himself to his Disciples after he was risen from the Dead*; and therefore but twice before, not on the *Jewish Sabbath* which came between. Which *second* assembling was employed in such *Religious Exercises* as was the first.

By the Miraculous Effusion of the *Holy-Ghost*, with the *Gift of Tongues*, on the day of *Pentecost* (which was also the *first day of the week*, being the *morrow after the Sabbath*,) when also, upon *Peter's* long Sermon, were added to the Church about *three Thousand* souls.

By *St. Paul's* Assembling with a *large Congregation* of *Disciples* then met at *Troas* purposely to *break bread* (or celebrate the *Lords Supper*) as being *the first day of the week* (proper for such religious exercise,) Preaching to them a long Sermon, and celebrating the *Lords Supper* with them.

By *St. Paul's* Directions to the Churches of *Galatia*, and to those at *Corinth* (who had their solemn Assemblies, or gathering together in the name of our Lord Jesus, *1 Cor. 5. 4.*) that on every first day of the week (*ἡ πρώτη τοῦ σαββάτου*) they should have a *Collection* for the *Saints*, *1 Cor. 16. 1, 2.* Which doth sufficiently intimate, on what day it was, that they were wont to have such solemn Assemblies.

By *St. John's* being in the Spirit on the *Lords day*, a day at the time known by that name, even before his writing the *Revelations* and both in that age and ever since (as appears from your own *Collections*) understood to be *the first day of the week*, and observed as such; the *Dominical day* (as you translate it) and the *first day of the week*, being (to use your own language) by all Christians in the world taken to be the same: and was, as such, solemnly observed, presently

after

after the Apostles time (as well as in it) as appears from *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, and others, who were none of the *Romish World*, and lived before the *Romish Usurpation*, which was not (as you acknowledge) for many ages after that time.

And all these precedents so fully cleared from those little exceptions (if I may so call them) that I see no reason in the least to question the matter of fact. Or if what I think *weak* and *little* you think to be *great* and momentous, I cannot help it. Let the Reader judge.

Now what was thus practised by Christ himself, and by his Apostles, and by these caused to be practised in the Constitution of the Christian Church, we have no cause to doubt but that they had sufficient authority for so doing. Otherwise we are at a loss as to most of what was done by them. They did appoint *Deacons* in the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Act. 6.* And, because they did it, we presume they had authority so to do. *Paul and Barnabas* ordained *Elders* in every Church, in their progress *Act. 14.* (whether *Deacons* also in every Church, or there only where they saw occasion, we cannot tell.) And *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, by *Paul's* direction, was to do the like there, as to *Bishops* and *Deacons*, *1 Tim. 4.* And *Titus* had the like order for *Creet* to ordain *Elders* in every City, *Tit. 1. 5.* And I find a *Bishop* there named, *ver. 7.* But whether *Bishop* and *Elder* be there the same, or how they differ, I list not here to dispute, because it is nothing to the present purpose: But of *Deacons* I find there no mention. And because these things were done, we presume they had sufficient authority so to do: though we do not find, from Christ, any express Command in particular for each of these. And the like to the *Corinthians* for their Church Assemblies, and therein for *Excommunicating*, or *delivering to Satan*, of the *Incestuous Corinthian*. *1 Cor. 5. 4, 5.* And their practise is to us a sufficient warrant for so doing. And the like for their Celebrating the *Lords-day*.

Now when the *Lords-day* was thus celebrated by Christ, by the Apostles, and by the Christian Church then, as well as ever since; and called *ἡ πρώτη τοῦ σαββάτου* the *Lords day*, just in the same form as *ἡ σίμωρ τοῦ σαββάτου* the *Lords Supper*; I think it reasonable to understand the same word in the same sense as to both: And as *ἡ σίμωρ τοῦ σαββάτου* the *Lords Supper* signifies the *Feast* or *Supper*, commanded by our Lord (meaning Our Lord Jesus Christ, as founder of the Christian Religion;) so *ἡ πρώτη τοῦ σαββάτου* the *Lords day* should signify the day commanded by our Lord (in the same sense) though that command be not particularly recorded. Like as we may reasonably suppose, that the *Worshiping*

ing

ing of God by *Sacrifice* (before the Flood) was *commanded*, (because it was accepted) though that *command* be not recorded; and that the distinction between *Clean and Unclean Beasts* was (before the Flood) *commanded* (because approved by God) though that *command* be not recorded; and that there was *command* (though not recorded) for taking the *fire for incense* from the *Altar*, *elle Nadab and Abihu* would not have been destroyed for offering *strange fire*; and as (beside Gods *resting* Gen. 2. 2, 3.) You do suppose *Adam and Eve* were *commanded to rest also*, though that *command* be not recorded: So, we may reasonably believe that the observation of the *Lords day*, was by our Lord *commanded* (because so practised by himself and the Christian Church) though that *particular Command* be not recorded. And this, though not recorded, seems to have been then so well known, that it was received without any scruple (that we find) as well as *Baptism* and the *Lords Supper*; All the question was, whether they must with *Baptism* retain *Circumcision*; and the Jewish *Pass-over* with the *Lords Supper*; and, with the *Lords day*, the Jewish *Sabbath* also. All which points the Apostle leaves *indifferent* as to the *Jews* (to whom they *had been a Law*) that each one might practice according as they were persuaded (and did himself comply therein;) but not as to the *Gentiles*, to whom it *had not been a Law*.

And this I think sufficient as to the *Observation* of the *Lords day*.

The next point is, Whether the *Lords day*, thus observed, may be called a *Sabbath*. For that is the great Objection, If so observed, and *wont to be* so observed, yet not upon a *Sabbatical* account, nor is it *any where* called a *Sabbath*. Rep. p. 37.

Now if I should admit (which I am not forward to do) what you have Rep. p. 50. that *all Judaical Observations of Days, whether Feasts or Fasts, Weekly, Monthly or Annual, were called their Sabbaths*: Or what you have Eng. p. 93. *When Christians do agree upon a day to assemble for the publick worship of God, there doth appear no great difference whether they Fast or Feast upon that day*: We need not be much solicitous about the *Name*. For, at that rate, no doubt but this may be called a *Sabbath*. And accordingly, because the *Pass-over* and *Pentecost*, are called *Festivals*, Lev. 23. you call them *Sabbaths*, Rep. p. 48.

But I am not willing to admit that loose acceptation of the Word: but take it to be a *Sabbath* in the proper sense of the word *Sabbath* in the *Fourth Commandment*: that is, *the Seventh day of Rest, next after Six days of Labour*. For so it is, if the *Lords day* be duly observed

served as it ought to be; and, as such, is within the prospect of the *Fourth Commandment*, what ever *Name* we call it by. For, in all the *Precedents* before alleged, we do not find any other than *Religious Exercises* therein performed, or what is consistent with such. And if your rule be good, to which you refer Eng. p. 47. *de non existentibus & non apparentibus eadem est ratio*: Or, what you would suppose, Rep. p. 33. that *Paul's preaching in the Synagogue did comprehend his conscientious observing the whole Sabbath day*: We are then to suppose as well, that the whole *Lords day* was spent in *Religious Exercises* or *Sabbatical employments*, (such as *Praying, Preaching, Exhortations, the Lords Supper, Collections for indigent Saints*, and other *Sabbatical Employments*) since no other appear.

But I do allow that, because of the Ambiguity which would arise if the *Jewish Sabbath* and the *Christian Sabbath* were indifferently called by the same name, without distinction; therefore, by way of distinction from the *Jewish Sabbath* (which was commonly understood by that name) the *Christian Sabbath* was commonly called (by a distinguishing title) *the first day of the week*, or the *Lords day*. And if you do not think fit to allow it the name of *Sabbath*, I shall be as well contented that you call it (as the Scripture doth, and the Christian Church ever since) *the Lords day*.

Yet I shall not presently grant you, (as Eng. p. 28.) that, *in the Old and New Testament the First day is never called the Sabbath*. For there be at least two places in the New Testament that bid fair for it, if they do not certainly so signify.

One is that in Mat. 24. 20. *Pray that your flight be not in the Winter, nor on the Sabbath-day*. I know you would restrain this to the Jewish Sabbath onely, not extend it to that of the Christians also: But it stands as fair for the *Christian Sabbath*. For it would be as well a grief, to the *Christians* to fly on *their Sabbath*, as for the *Jews* on *theirs*; (though not a *Sin* in either, in a case of necessity.) And though the *Christian Sabbath* were not yet in use when Christ spake the words, yet it would be so before the case happened; and though the Disciples at present might not then be aware of that sense, it would be time enough then to understand it, when there should be occasion for it. For so it was in many other cases. As Joh. 2. 19, 21, 22. *Destroy this Temple* (saith Christ) *and in three days I will raise it up*; meaning it of *the temple of his body*; which though the disciples did not presently understand, yet when he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and then they understood his meaning. And Joh. 13. 7. (*Jesus to Peter, about washing his feet*,) *What I do, thou knowest not now,* but

but thou shalt know hereafter. And ver. 10, 11. *Ye are clean* (saith Christ) but not all; For he knew who should betray him, and therefore said *Ye are not all clean*. So Joh. 19, 24. *They parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots*, and ver. 28, 29. of giving him gall and vinegar to drink, and ver. 36. *a bone of him shall not be broken*, and ver. 37. *they shall look on him whom they pierced*; were not things so understood till long after they were spoken. And Joh. 14, 26. Christ tells his disciples, *The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, shall Teach you all things and bring to your Remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you*; and so bring to their Remembrance, as that they should then better understand them, than when they were first spoken. Accordingly when he bids them *Pray* that their flight be not on the Sabbath; that is, on such a day as shall then be Sabbath. And in the Greek it is *ἐν σαββάτῳ* on a Sabbath, not *ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ* on The Sabbath. You make sometimes a great matter of the difference between *a* and *the*, when you think it for your advantage; and you may as well take notice that the article *The* is here (in the Original) omitted; and *a Sabbath* may as well relate to any Sabbath or day of Holy Rest, as to the Jews Seventh-day Sabbath. And I could cite to you the authorities (if that were the way of argument between you and me) of *eminently Holy and Learned men*, who think the Christian Sabbath to be here meant, though the disciples were not then aware of it, but should be before the time came. And I do the rather take it so to be, because Christ bids them *Pray* that it should not be on what should then be their Sabbath. But it is notoriously known that it did happen on the Jews Sabbath (though not on the Lords day, or Christian Sabbath,) and it doth not seem likely, that Christ would bid them *Pray*, against what he knew was to come to pass, but rather against what (upon such prayer) they might escape; as accordingly they did, their flight not happening on the Christian Sabbath. And it is noted by Dio Cassius who relates the Story, that their Superstitious observing that day (so as not to labour on it, though in their own defense) was the occasion of its being on that day; the Romans (being aware of it) making their Assault on that day.

The other place is Act. 13, 42. *When the Jews were gone out of the Synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath*; (so we translate it;) It is in the Greek *ἐν τῷ μετὰ τῷ σαββάτῳ*. I remember you object Rep. p. 79. that if the Christians did observe the first day of the week, why did not the Gentiles desire these words to be preached to them the next day, rather than the next Sabbath? meaning, the next Jewish Sabbath.

The

The Gentiles (you say) besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath; not the next morning upon the First day of the week; but, the next Sabbath. Now, it seems to me much one, the next Sabbath (meaning the Christian Sabbath,) was the next day, and that on this day they did desire to hear further discourse on the same subject. 'Tis true that our Translators render it barely, the next Sabbath; but they tell us in the Margin, that it is in the Greek, *in the Sabbath between*; and so it is, *ἐν τῷ μετὰ τῷ σαββάτῳ*. We are told ver. 14. that they (Paul and Barnabas) at Antioch in Pisidia, went into the Synagogue *τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ* on the Sabbath day (where observe, that *σαββάτῳ* though in the plural number, doth signify not many but one Sabbath-day; for it is not *ἐν αἰσιν ἡμέραις*, but *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ*, *ἐν σαββάτῳ*, contrary to your observation Eng. p. 79. where you say it is *no where* so used; which though you do retract Rep. p. 46. yet even here you be hankering upon it, that the plural number doth ordinarily signify More than one.) And, though but One day, it may well be called *ἡμέρα ἡ σαββάτου* (the day of Rest) because in that one day there were to be more Rests than One; a Rest from Sin, a Rest from Labours of divers sorts, from finding our own pleasure, and speaking our own words, and a holy Rest in Religious Exercises, delighting our selves in the Lord, and the like. Of their Sermon there (or as it is there called a Word of Exhortation to the people) we have a large account ending at ver. 41. And at ver. 44. we have an account of what passed on the next Sabbath, or the ensuing Sabbath, *τὴν ἐξουσίαν σαββάτου*, or *τὴν ἐξουσίαν σαββάτου* (for 'tis read both ways to the same sense,) meaning the next Jewish Sabbath (as appears by the Company there present ver. 45. &c.) But in the former of those two Sabbaths when the Jews were gone out of the Synagogue, or when they were gone out of the Synagogue of the Jews (for the Greek will indifferently bear either translation) the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to Them (separately from the Jews) *ἐν τῷ μετὰ τῷ σαββάτῳ* on the Sabbath between, or on the intermediate Sabbath. For as *μετὰ τῷ σαββάτῳ* doth in the Greek signify the intermediate time, or the time between; so *ἐν τῷ μετὰ τῷ σαββάτῳ* is the Sabbath between or the intermediate Sabbath. Now what can be that intermediate Sabbath (between two next Sabbaths of the Jews) on which they should preach to the Gentiles (in contradistinction to the Jews) but the Christian Sabbath on the first day of the week. Which by our Translators is well enough rendered the next Sabbath (as being indeed the next day) with this note upon it, that (in the original) it is the Sabbath between. And even upon the dissolution of that first assembly (when the congregation was broken up) many of the Jews and religious

L

Pro-

*Profelytes* (not waiting till the next Jewish Sabbath) followed Paul and Barnabas (for further instruction therein) who speaking (or preaching) to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God, ver. 43. So that here, I think, the first day is again called the Sabbath; not the Jewish Sabbath, but the Sabbath between two Jewish Sabbaths.

And I take it also to be so called in the Fourth Commandment, *Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day*, or the day of Rest, that is such day as from time to time shall be the Sabbath day. *Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work; but the seventh day* (after those six days of labour) *the Sabbath of the Lord thy God*. This seventh day was (I suppose) at that time, the seventh day from the first raining of Manna, *Exod. 16. 21, 22, 25, 26*. But that it was always to continue in course from the first raining of Manna, I do not find; nor am I sure that it did so continue even to our Saviours time, but might be intermitted, and forgotten during the Babylonish Captivity, till it was again renewed by Nehemiah: And if, upon our Saviours Resurrection, another day did thenceforth become the Sabbath (as I think it did;) whatever day should from time to time become the Sabbath, that day they were to keep holy. And this without any change in the Commandment at all. I suppose you do allow that the Affirmative part of the Second Commandment doth require us to observe Gods instituted Worship, (or, that he should be worshiped in such manner as himself appoints,) and consequently, the Levitical Priesthood and Sacrifices so long as they should continue; as being Gods then-instituted Worship, as *Eng. p. 68*. But when God, instead thereof, gave us a more spiritual Ministry (as you own it to be,) That then ceased, and This began, to be Gods instituted Worship, and did (without any alteration of that Law at all) fall under the Second Commandment, as, before, the other did. In like manner, the seventh Commandment, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, binds the Woman to this Husband; but if this husband be dead and she marry to another, the same law (not one jot or tittle altered) binds her to this other husband; as the Apostle argues *Rom. 7. 2, 3*. For, though the Case be altered, the Law is still the same. And in like manner, if the Lords day become now the Christians day of holy Rest, (as we think it doth) this now is the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, as much as the Seventh day from the first raining of Manna was before. Like as the second husband (after the death of the first) becomes the Husband in the Seventh Commandment, as much as the First was while he was living. And the Lords day is now as much the seventh day after the six days of Labour, as was that other from the first raining of Manna. But whether this or that or neither, be the seventh day in course from the first Cre-

Creation, neither you nor I know; nor is it necessary that we should. As to what you object hereupon (*Rep. p. 2, 3*. and very often afterward to the like purpose) if I do not know nor can know what day of the week Sunday is, why should I write a book for the observation of a day which it is impossible to know? My Answer is, I know very well which day of our Week it is; and write for the observation of this day: But what day of the week it is in a continual circulation of weeks from the Creation, I do not know (nor do you) and therefore for such first or seventh day, I do not write: and if you write for such seventh day, you write for you know not what. And I write for that Lords-day, which I take to be so in a continual succession from Christs time; so far as that can be known: that is (as you speak *Rep. p. 3*.) *What all Christian and Hebrew Churches in the World agree to be it*: Or (*Eng. p. 78*.) *if all Jews and Christians in the world be not out in their reckoning*: Or if that be it, which you say (*Eng. p. 93*.) *all the Christians in the World agree to be it*. That is, so far as we may trust to an Universal Tradition in a matter of fact. For this Universal agreement, is but Universal Tradition and no more: And more than this you cannot have, nor do pretend to have, for determining, which is your Seventh day. And therefore I did you no wrong in saying (*Disc. p. 1*.) that you have no other way (than Common Tradition) whereby to guess which is the first or seventh day in such circulation even from Christs time, (though when you cite my words, you think fit to leave out other than common tradition.) So far as this can assure us we are assured; but beyond this, neither you nor I can be sure which is the day. Nor do I think it much material, whether we be or be not mistaken therein, if we observe the day which is so reputed. According as before I have shewed, of the Jews Pass-over and New-moons. For (according to the method they are said to have observed for determining the day of the New-Moon, and consequently the Day and Month of the Pass-over thereupon depending, viz. by the first sight of the Moon after the Change,) it was a rare case not to miss of the true day, (for 'tis very rare to see the Moon on the true day of the New-Moon;) and, in case the Full-moon was near the Equinox, it might be equally uncertain, which was the First Month: Yet the Pass-over, and the New Moons; were Religiously Observed, on the reputed Day, of the reputed Month; and it was, I doubt not, as well accepted as if on the just day: and so would be our Lords day, if possibly we should mistake, in the common Tradition. And the case is just the same with you as with us, as to this point; for you act blind-fold in guessing which day is a seventh in course from the Cre-

ation; and with more *Uncertainty*, than we do in judging which is the *Lords day* in a continual succession from *Christs time*; of which you tell us that *all Jews and Christians in the World* are agreed, which is the *Dominical day*. And it is much more likely that *our common tradition*, as to the *Lords day*, since *Christs time*, doth not deceive us, than *yours for the seventh day* in course from the *first Creation*. For, by your own confession, no nation but the *Jews* (if they) observed this *seventh from the Creation*; nor yet (for ought appears) did even the *Jews* reckon their time by *weeks* till after their coming out of *Egypt*: Whereas, since *Christs time*, and the planting of *Christianity*, 'tis the general way of reckoning every where; and if one nation should chance to *mis-take* or *forget* it, others would rectify it.

This point being thus dispatched; It remains to enquire, Whether (beside the *Lords-day*) we are to observe the *Jewish Sabbath* also. Be not offended (as sometimes you seem to be *Rep. p. 51. 55.*) that I call it the *Jewish Sabbath*. For I find, you can also so call it; as *Enq. p. 38. The Jews Seventh-day-sabbath*; and *p. 66. the Jewish Sabbath*; and *p. 74. the Jewish Seventh-day Sabbath*: and elsewhere. Nor do I mean any hurt in so calling it; or thereby to Reproach the day. For I would not Reproach, either *Circumcision*, or the *Pass over*, or the *Levitical Priesthood*; or any of the *Sacrifices*, or *Ceremonies* of the *Ceremonial Law*, which was *then* the appointed Service of God, though now it be not. I use it only as a *distinctive name* from that of the *Lords-day*. For I take this *now* to be a *Sabbath day*, and the *Seventh-day Sabbath*, (intended in the Fourth Commandment,) as much as the *Jews Seventh-day-Sabbath*, *then* was: that is (not only *A Seventh-day*, as you use to distinguish, but) *The seventh-day after six days of Labour*: Though possibly not the *seventh* in course from the *first Creation*, nor perhaps the *seventh* in course from the *first raining of Manna*.

That the *Lords-day*, was, and is to be Observed; I think I have sufficiently shewed already. As to that other question, whether the *Jewish Sabbath* ought to be observed also: You seem to answer for me, *Enq. p. 46. Nor are there two Weekly days set apart by God for holy Worship*, and so I think this question needs no further Labour. And *Rep. p. 33. I know none has yet imagined that Paul and the Christians kept two Sabbath days in one Week*. And yet again *Rep. p. 66. I take as agreed, we are not to keep two days in a Week*. All which are your own words.

But I think fit to answer it a little more distinctly. I would distinguish between what is *now* our *Duty*, and what might *then* by the *Jews* lawfully be done. I do not think it is *now* our *Duty* (be-

(beside *Baptism*) to use *Circumcision*; or (beside the *Lords Supper*) to use the *Jewish Pass-over*: Yet I think it *then* was lawful for a *Jew* to use both (if they were so perswaded) till by time, and leisure, they should come better to understand their *Christian Liberty*. Which your self, I think, will not deny. But I do not think *The Jews* (and much less the *Gentiles*) to be under an *Obligation* so to do. And I suppose you do allow this also; For you think (*Enq. p. 122.*) that *Paul did keep the Jewish Pass-over*, but (*p. 123.*) that *he was under no Obligation so to do*.

And I take the case of the *Jewish Sabbath* to be just the same. Those of the *Jews* who were *zealous of the Law*, thinking the *Mosaick Law* was yet in force as to *Circumcision* and other *Rites* as well as to their *Sabbath*, did think themselves obliged (though indeed they were not, otherwise than by the mistake of an Erroneous Conscience) to observe *Circumcision* and their *Sabbath*, together with *Baptism* and the *Lords-day*. And those who did not think themselves so *Obliged*, did yet think it *Lawful* so to do, (as is undeniable in the Case of *Paul*.) And it was not only *Lawful* but *Commendable*, to take the opportunity of a publick Concourse whether of *Jews* or *Gentiles*, as well on *that* as on any *other day*, to *preach* to them the Gospel of *Christ*. For so we find they did, not only on the *Sabbath*, but *daily in the Temple*, *Act. 2. 46. Act. 5. 42.* and *in the Market daily Act. 17. 17.* and *in Arcopagus, or Mars-hill, ver. 22.* And no man doubts, I think, (or need doubt) but that we may lawfully meet on *other days* than the *Lords-day* for the *Worship of God*.

You tell us indeed *Enq. p. 121.* that on the other six days we are *Commanded to Labour*; and complain *p. 131.* (as an incroachment on our working time) that *this part of the Fourth Command (six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do) is in effect much laid aside* (by appointing the Service of God on some of those days;) and *Rep. p. 6. the other six Allowed for Work*, or rather *wherein we are Commanded to work*. But, I hope you do not think, we are so *Commanded* then to work, as that we are *Forbid* to *Pray*, or to *hear a Sermon*, on one of those days. If God do not (in the fourth Commandment) *command* any other day (to all in general;) yet neither doth he there *Forbid* it. You may remember that, in the *Mosaick Law*, besides the *commanded services*, there were *Free-will Offerings* that might be offered. And (whatever your opinion be against *meeting twice* in publick for *Sabbath services* on the *Sabbath-day*.) I should hope you would think it *allowable* (for those whose other occasions may Well permit it) to attend a *Week-day Lecture*, where it may conveniently be had. And the Apostles,

no

no doubt, whose daily business it was to preach the Gospel, might (on this day as well as any other) take the opportunity, of the Jews meeting in the *Synagogue* (as well as of the *Athenians* meeting in the *Market* *Act. 17. 17.*) to preach the Word to them. And I think it might be as *Lawful* then (though not a *Duty*) for the *Believing Jews*, to meet on *their Sabbath*, as it was to practice *Circumcision*, if they were so persuaded. But to impose it on the *Gentiles* as a *Duty*, was (I think) not then to be done, and much less now.

By *Gentiles* I do not hear mean *Circumcised Proselytes*; for these (though *naturally Gentiles* and not of the seed of *Abraham*) did (by being circumcised) become *naturalized Jews*, and thereby members of the *Jewish Church* (and might eat the *Pass-over*) as well as if they had been *Native Jews*, *Exod. 12. 48.* But I mean those *Christian Gentiles* (yet *uncircumcised*) concerning whom the question now was whether they ought to be circumcised and observe the Law of *Moses*, *Act. 15. 1, 5, 24. Gal. 5. 1, 2, 3.* For some Jews (or *Judaizing Christians*) taught the Brethren, that Except they were circumcised, after the manner of *Moses*, they could not be saved: As if *Salvation* were so of the Jews, as that, without being brought within the Pale of the *Jewish Church*, they could not be saved by their *Messias*.

Somewhat consonant to your doctrine, *Eng. p. 79.* that the Jews in *Egypt*, was the whole visible Church of Christ in the World. (I should have said the Church of God, in contradistinction to the Christian Church: Nor would I have said the whole Church.) That they were a considerable part, and that they were more peculiarly so, because of the promise made to *Abraham* and his seed, of which *Circumcision* was a Sign; thus much I had granted, *Dist. p. 60.* with which you are not satisfied, *Rep. p. 52.* But that they (as the seed of *Abraham*) were the whole visible Church of God, I cannot allow. I think that *Melchizedek* (a Priest of the most High God) whoever he was, and his people, were part of Gods Visible Church; though not of the seed of *Abraham*, nor circumcised (that I know) or required so to be. And the like of *Lot* (righteous *Lot*, though not circumcised, that I know of, nor required so to be, nor any member of the Jewish Church,) and his Family, and his posterity (so long as they continued to worship the true God;) and *Abrahams* kindred at *Ur* and *Haran*; who though they were not of the seed of *Abraham* (nor incorporated into his family;) yet I do not know that they had cast off the Worship of the true God (though perhaps otherwise faulty;) and all the Posterity of *Abraham* by *Keturah*;  
many

many of whom, no doubt, did for a long time continue to worship the true God: who though of *Abraham's* posterity yet were no part of the *Jewish Church in Egypt*, whom yet (*Eng. p. 79. Rep. p. 52.*) you would have to be the whole Church. The like of *Jethro* (Priest, or Prince of *Midian*) of whom we have a large account *Exod. 2. and Exod. 18.* was doubtless (as thence appears) a good man, and a worshiper of the true God; but the *Midianites*, (as well as the *Edomites*, the *Moabites*, the *Ammonites*, the *Amalekites*, and others,) are still contradistinguished to the *Israelites* brought out of *Egypt*. And no doubt but many of *Jethro's* people, as well as himself, were Worshipers of the true God, and part of Gods Visible Church. And I judge the like of *Aner*, and *Eshcol*, and *Mamre*, (*Abrams* Confederates *Gen. 14. 13, 24.*) though they lived in *Canaan*, as he did. And there is no doubt of *Job*, and his three Friends, (who seem all to be Princes, or Great men, and to have great Dependences) and *Elihu* (who was a fourth,) were part of Gods visible Church; and many of their people or dependents; but no part of the *Israelites in Egypt*, though contemporary with them. Nor can it be said of any of them, that God brought them out of the land of *Egypt*, out of the house of bondage. And I do not know but that *Balaam* (though otherwise a bad man, as *Cain* also was,) might be a Worshiper of the true God. And the *Kenites* also, (of whose kindness to the *Israelites* we find mention, *Judg. 4. 11, 17.*) And the *Widow of Sarepta* (a *Zidonian*) *1 King. 17.* And *Naaman the Syrian*, *2 King. 5. 15, 17.* who owns that there is no other God in all the earth but the God of *Israel*, and would thenceforth, offer neither burnt offerings nor sacrifice to any other God, but unto the LORD (*Jehovah*.) And I see no cause to question it, but that many others of those who were *Proselyti Portæ*, though not *Proselyti Fœderis* (as they use to be distinguished) were good men, and worshipers of the true God, and members of Gods visible Church, though not of the Jewish Church. Such I suppose was the *Centurion* *Luk. 7.* who though he loved their nation and built them a *Synagogue*, ver. 5. yet was not of the Jewish Church, as appears ver. 9. I have not found so great faith, no not in *Israel*. And the same is manifest in *Cornelius*: Who was a devout man, and one that feared God, and all his house, *Act. 10. 2.* (and, amongst the rest, his two household servants, and the devout souldier who waited on him, that were sent for *Peter*, ver. 7.) with many of his kindred and near friends, ver. 24, 33, 44, 46; and was one whose prayers were heard and his alms were had in memorial before God, ver. 4, 31. a just man, and one that feared God, and (though not a Jew) of good report among all the nation of the Jews, ver. 22. and who was there.

therefore (even before his becoming Christian upon Peter's preaching) one of Gods visible Church (as were those others also with him;) yet not a Jew, nor in communion with the Jewish Church; but one of another nation, with whom it was thought unlawful for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto him, ver. 28. that is, to have familiar converse with him. So that the Jewish Church was not the Whole visible Church of God. And this Peter acknowledgeth ver. 34, 35. of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him. Nor was this then a New truth (how contemptibly soever the Jews thought of other nations) but is cited from Deut. 10. 17, 18, 19. And accordingly Peter (at ver. 47, 48.) admits them all to Christian Baptism, without requiring them first to be circumcised or become Jews.

I do not deny but that the Jews had many advantages above the Gentiles; as Paul argues Rom. 3. 1, 2. chiefly, because to them were committed the oracles of God, whereby they had better opportunity of knowing his will; But as to the Rule of Salvation, it was the same to both; as he there argues ver. 24. &c. The righteousness of God by faith in Jesus Christ is unto all and upon all that believe (whether Jew or Gentile) for there is no difference. And Rom. 4. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. he argues at large that this blessedness cometh not upon the Circumcision onely (on the Jewish Church onely) but upon the Uncircumcision also; for that Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness, not when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision; and he received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had being yet Uncircumcised; that he might be the Father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also.

And I should have thought you might have been of the same mind, by what you argued Eng. p. 26. Before the Moral law given, one law was to the Jews and Gentiles; and we may say, What difference was there Then or is there Now, between them and us? Those of the Jews or Gentiles then, living and dying impenitently, had not Salvation by the Messiah: Those of Them or the Gentiles then, who joined themselves to the Lord, to serve him, had eternal Life. And if so, I see not why they should not be thought part of God's visible Church. 'Tis true that, without being Circumcised they might not eat the Pass-over Exod. 12. 28. because not of the Jewish Church; but it doth not therefore follow that they were not of the Church of God.

So that Salvation, even then, was not confined to the Jewish Church

Church, or the Seed of Abraham, but common to all that believed, to all that did fear God and work righteousness, of whatever Nation. And those who did so, were part of Gods visible Church, though not Jews, nor incorporated into their Church. So that those then in Egypt were not the whole visible Church of God, as you would have it Eng. p. 79. Rep. p. 52. But if by those words who join themselves to the Lord, you mean onely those who joyned themselves to the Jewish Church (as if none but such might be saved by their Messiah, though otherwise fearing God and serving him,) You perfectly fall in with those Judaizing Christians (Act. 15. 1. Gal. 5. 1.) who taught the Brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.

And therefore I am still of opinion (notwithstanding your thinking otherwise) that what God says to the Jews, as well of Circumcision, as the Jewish Sabbath (on the seventh day from the first raining of Manna) as a Sign, or Covenant between him and them, is intended as a distinctive mark given to the Jews, as Gods more peculiar People (not as the whole visible Church) in contradistinction to other Nations. Of Circumcision he says to Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God to thee, and thy seed after thee; (not as you would have it Rep. p. 52. with all true believers of all nations, in all ages, from the beginning of the world to the end of it, to distinguish them from the disobedient to Gods law.) And ver. 10, 11. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee (is this meant of All Nations to the Worlds end? to wit) every male child amongst you shall be circumcised, and it shall be a token of the Covenant between me and you (that is, You the seed of Abraham; for no other were to be circumcised, unless incorporated with them.) And ver. 13. my Covenant shall be in your flesh an everlasting Covenant, (not as if Circumcision were to be for ever obligatory; but, while things continued in that State of distinction between Jews and Gentiles.) And in like manner concerning the Jewish Sabbath, Exod. 31. 13. My Sabbaths ye shall keep, for it is a Sign between me and You (that is, You the Children of Israel to whom it was spoken) throughout your Generations. And ver. 16. the Children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual Covenant, and ver. 17. It is a Sign between me and the Children of Israel for ever (which plainly shews, who were meant by You). So Ezek. 20. 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20. Son of man, speak to the Elders of Israel — In the day when I chose Israel, and lifted

lifted up my hand unto the Seed of the house of Jacob, and made my self known to them in the land of Egypt, — to bring them forth of the land of Egypt, — I caused them to go forth of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the Wilderness. — I gave them (in the Wilderness) my Sabbaths to be a Sign between me and them (who are these, but those that were brought out of Egypt,) but the house of Israel rebelled against me in the Wilderness, (are these all true believers from the beginning of the world, to the world's end?) — and my Sabbaths they polluted; — But I said unto their Children in the wilderness, — walk in my Statutes — and hallow my Sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between me and you, &c. Who can these be, but the people of Israel as contradistinguished from other people? the Jews as contradistinguished from the Gentiles? Yet when you tell us from hence (*Enq.* p. 26.) and particularly from *Exod.* 31. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. that 'tis called, a sign for ever between him and his people, to distinguish his people from others; you think much (*Rep.* p. 52.) that I should understand it (*Disc.* p. 60.) of the people of Israel: though, in the place by you cited (*Exod.* 31. 17.) it be expressly said, *It is a sign between me and the Children of Israel.* And therefore (whatever You mean by it) the meaning of the Text is the people of Israel. Like to that of *Exod.* 11. 7. *The Lord doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel.*

And here I think it is not improper to take notice of that solemn Clause (which we often meet with, both as to Circumcision, and the Jewish Sabbath, as well as other Rites) namely in your generations. *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will establish my Covenant, between me and thy seed after thee [in their generations] for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God to thee and thy seed after thee.* And ver. 9. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy seed after thee [in their generations.]* And ver. 12. *He that is eight days old shall be circumcised amongst you, every male-child [in your generations.]* Where I take the words in your generations, to be (verba minuentia) Words of Abatement. An Everlasting Covenant, but, to whom? To the Seed of Abraham (not to all the world.) And how long? In your Generations; so long as you and they continue to be a separate generation distinguished from the rest of the World; not when that wall of Separation shall be taken away. So concerning the Manna, *Exod.* 16. 32. *Fill an Omer of it to be kept [for your Generations;]* and ver. 33. *Lay it up before the Lord, to be kept [for your Generations.]* And of their Sabbaths, *Exod.* 31. 13. *My Sabbaths ye shall keep, for it is a sign between me and you, [throughout your Generations.]* And v. 16, 17. *The Children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath [through-*

[throughout their Generations,] for a perpetual Covenant; it is a sign between me and the Children of Israel for ever. 'Tis so, a perpetual Covenant, as yet to be confined to the Children of Israel (as Circumcision was to the Seed of Abraham,) and while they continued a separate Generation from the rest of Mankind. I speak still of the Jewish Sabbath (from the first raining of Manna,) not of what might be afterward appointed in the room of that, when that should cease.

But when you tell us (*Rep.* p. 52.) that when you say *To distinguish Gods people from others*, Your meaning was and is throughout, that the Sabbath (this Saturday Sabbath) was and is a perpetual sign and Covenant with all True Israelites, that is, all the Believers of all Nations, in all Ages, from the Beginning of the World to the End of it, to distinguish such from the Disobedient to Gods Law: Pray consider, how unkind you are to all the Christian World except your self (and some few more) whom, because they do not observe your Saturday Sabbath, you exclude from the number of Gods People, of true Israelites, of true Believers; and rank them with the disobedient to Gods laws, whom you elsewhere call (with great displeasure) the Anomists, the Ungodly, with other the like hard terms. Is this agreeable to that Candour you promised (*Enq.* p. 3, 4.) to the Advocates for the First-day? Must we All be excluded from the the number of Gods people? I should have thought, that, when you complain of Heats, and carrying it High, which (you say) you much dislike, because you are persuaded that many of both sides (whoever do mistake) do conscientiously mistake: you would have had so much charity for us, as to think some of us may yet be Gods People; and so much modesty as to think the mistake may possibly be on your side, rather than on the whole body of Christians (some very few excepted) who Religiously observe the Lords-day.

But whatever those Jews or Judaizing Christians did pretend; as if Salvation were not to be had out of the Jewish Church, (as being the whole Church of God) and therefore, the Gentiles, if they expected Salvation must first by circumcision be brought within the pale of that Church, (and consequently obnoxious to the whole Mosaic Law, *Gal.* 5. 3.) The Apostles doctrine was otherwise, that the pale was now taken away, the inclosure laid open and disparted, the wall of partition broken down, and what advantages had before been peculiar to the Jews, were now in common to Gentiles also, without becoming members of the Jewish Church. And therefore he doth

exhort them to *stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and not to be intangled with the yoke of bondage to the Jewish Church, Gal. 5. 1.* What was before a *sign or mark of distinction* between Jew and Gentile, being now at an end at least as to the Gentiles, however the Jews might yet be permitted, if yet unsatisfied, to continue their former practice; without imposing it on the Gentiles, (to whom before it had not been a law: ) And the same was the sense of the *Synod of Jerusalem, Act. 15.* and of *James with the brethren Act. 21. 17.*

Now I suppose you will not say, that the *Gentiles*, before this time, did observe the *Jewish Sabbath*, (so that, to them, it was a new thing, ) For you tell us again and again that *they (all nations, Rep. p. 74.) worshiped the Sun upon Sunday*; their day of Worship (such as it was) was on another day.

And, though I am not of your opinion, that they did (any of them) worship the Sun upon Sunday any more than on another day, or that the name of Sunday (or of the other week-days) was then known: Yet I do believe they did not observe the *Jewish Sabbath*; because this was a *sign of a perpetual Covenant*, between God and the Children of Israel, *Exod. 31. 16, 17.* (as, in a peculiar manner, their God, in contradistinction to other Nations,) as was *Circumcision*, a sign or token of such Covenant between God and the seed of Abraham, *Gen. 17. 9, 11.* And though you are not willing to understand it of God and the Children of Israel (though it be expressly said so, in those very words, *between me and the Children of Israel*) but between God and his People (from the beginning of the world to the end thereof,) Yet when you do contend also that *this people* were then the whole visible Church; if but a distinction between God and his people, you must admit that the Gentiles (who were then not a people, *1 Pet. 2. 10.* or not his people, *Rom. 9. 25, 26.*) did not observe it, (else how could this be a sign, or token of distinction, even between God and his people?) So that the *Jewish Sabbath* was to them, a new thing. And your self own it so to be *Rep. p. 51. That it was then New to the Heathens I agree*, be your own words.

Now, as to such new things to be introduced on the Gentiles, from the Jewish Church, we find it resolved on a solemn Argument, by the Synod at Jerusalem, *Act. 15.* not to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which from the Gentiles are turned unto God, *ver. 10, 19.* It seemed good (say they) unto the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burdens than those necessary things, That ye abstain from meat offered to Idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep your selves ye shall

shall do well, *ver. 28, 29.* But there is nothing of the *Jewish Sabbath* amongst these necessary things. And to the same purpose, *James and all the Elders*, assembled at Jerusalem, *Act. 21. 18.* where they tell Paul, that many thousands of the believing Jews, who were all zealous of the Law, had been informed, that he taught all the Jews which are amongst the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying, That they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the Customs, *ver. 20, 21.* (of which Customs, that of the Jewish Sabbath was certainly one.) And do advise him (for the removing of that prejudice, and acquitting himself from that false information) to purify himself together with four men which had a Vow on them, to shew that himself (being a Jew) did walk orderly and keep the Law, *ver. 23, 24.* But as touching the Gentiles which believe (say they) we have written and concluded, that they observe no such thing, save onely that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication, *ver. 25.* Why these particular things were insisted on as necessary at that season, I list not now to dispute, because I would not suggest new matter of dispute between me and you, (which yet I think is there intimated, at *Act. 15. 20, 21.* compared with *Gen. 9. 5.* which was a precept ancients than Circumcision, and the Mosaic Law.) But here is no mention of the *Jewish Sabbath*, as necessary to the Gentiles, in either place: which certainly would have been, if necessary for them to observe; it being to them a new thing, out of the law of Moses, and which was before a distinctive sign or token peculiar to them, and not observed by any other. And certainly as considerable (if not more) than abstaining from things strangled, and from blood; which perhaps You do not think to be now necessary.

You'll say perhaps, that neither is there mention of the Lords day. True: nor yet of Baptism, or the Lords Supper, nor of ordaining Elders in every Church: Because these were Christian institutions; and no part of what was there in question. For it was not doubted whether the Christian Gentiles should observe the Christian Institutions; but, whether (with them) they were bound to observe also the Mosaic Law; for that was the point then in question, *Act. 15. 1, 5, 6, 24.* There rose up certain of the Sect of the Pharisees, which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the Law of Moses. And the Apostles and Elders came together to consider of This Matter, (not about the Christian Institutions) Where, by the Law of Moses, is not meant onely, what was newly appointed by Moses, after their coming out of Egypt; but it looks back as far as Circumcision (which

(which was older than *Moses*) and to the Law given to *Noah* concerning *Blood*; and, I suppose, the Law of *Sacrifice* (which was older than either :) For all these (so far as they were new to them) came to the *Gentiles* as from *Moses*, that is, from the *Jewish Church constituted by Moses*, and therefore is called the *Law of Moses*. And, of all that is here enjoy'd on the *Gentiles* out of this *Law Moses*, the *Jewish Sabbath* is no part.

Now this, I think, (as sometimes you speak) goes a great way in the case. You do not pretend (for ought I see) that any other nation than the *Jews* (and their *Proselytes*) did then observe the *Jewish Sabbath*: For you grant it (*Enq. p. 26. Rep. p. 52.*) to be a *distinctive mark, or sign*, it not *between God and the Children of Israel*, at least *between God and his People* (which people, I presume you do not take to be the *Unconverted Heathens*; and therefore not, by them, observed.) 'Tis true that the *Heathens* did know of the *Jewish Sabbath*, and of their *Circumcision* too; but they did equally despise both, (*Recutitaque Sabbata pallent*;) not observe either. And therefore, if it were now to be newly imposed upon them, 'tis much that it should not be recommended as one of those *necessary things* which it was fit for them to observe, as well as *abstinence from Blood, and things strangled*. Which when we find it was not, I think we have reason to conclude, that though the *Jews* were permitted to continue the practice of *That*, and of *Circumcision*, yet neither one nor the other to be imposed upon the *Gentiles*; who had *Baptism* in stead of one, and the *Lords day* instead of the other; as they had the *Lords Supper* instead of their *Pass-over*, and a more excellent *Ministry* instead of the *Levitical Priesthood*. Mean while I do not speak against the *Sabbath of the fourth Commandment* (the seventh day after six days of labour, as is the *Lords day*) but the *Jewish Sabbath* (the seventh day from the first raining of *Manna*, or that of the *Jewish week*) being imposed upon the *Gentiles* together with that of the *Lords-day*.

And therefore when you say (*Rep. p. 52.*) that *I there make the Sabbath abolished*; it is your mistake. This *seventh-day Sabbath* (those were my words, *Disc. p. 60.*) for which you please to put absolutely *the Sabbath*, (as though I would have no *Sabbath* to be now observed,) *Which seventh-day Sabbath* (you own *Enq. p. 26.*) *to be a sign for ever between him and his people to Distinguish his people from others* (which are your own words,) that is, (say I, not as your words, but as my own,) *the people of Israel from other nations*; and, *so to be a Sign for Ever, as Circumcision is an Everlasting Covenant*. Because (in the place by you there cited, *Exod. 31. 17.*)

it is expressly said, *It is a sign between me and the Children of Israel for ever*. But if by *the Children of Israel* (as you now tell us) you do not understand *the Children of Israel*, I cannot help it. I hope 'twill be no offense to tell you, that I do; and *between them and others*, to be *between Jews and Gentiles*; and that, *a Sign for ever*, and a *perpetual Covenant*, I understand in the same sense as when *Circumcision* is called an *Everlasting Covenant* *Gen. 17. 13.* And what is there said of *Circumcision* (*ver. 11.*) *it is a token of the Covenant between me and you*, that is (*ver. 9.*) *thou and thy seed after thee in their generations*, is the same (as to the seed of *Abraham*) with what is here said of this *seventh-day Sabbath* (as to the *Children of Israel*) *Exod. 31. 13.* *it is a Sign between me and you throughout your generations*. And the like of the *Pass-over*, *Exod. 12. 24.* *Ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy Sons for ever*: that is, so long as this *Oeconomy* or *Administration* should continue. Now, what was a *Distinctive Mark* of the *People of Israel* from other *Nations*, (as was *Circumcision*, the *Jews Pass-over* and *seventh-day Sabbath*;) was, I said, *at an end and to cease* (that is, to expire, for which words, you put *abolished*) when *Christ* had broken down the partition wall between *Jew and Gentile*, and made both *One*, and abolished the *Enmity* (which are the *Apostles* words there cited from *Ephes. 2. 14, 15.*) but instead of *abolished the Enmity*, you would have it that *I make the Sabbath abolished*. And at the same time (while you thus pervert my words) you complain of *Artifice*, and *Blamable*, (as if yours were not so,) for telling you that, by *the Children of Israel* (whatever you mean) I mean *the Children of Israel*, that is, *the Jews*. Between whom, and the *Gentiles*, this was a *Distinctive Mark*: and therefore then to expire when the *Distinction* was to cease.

As to what you there add (*Rep. p. 52.*) *He repeats, that the Sabbath is a Sign, yet doubts it was either not observed at all, or long before this time had been forgotten*: I do not understand the Wit of this *Repartee*, (unless it ly in perverting my words;) Might not the *seventh day in course from the first raining of Manna*, be a *distinctive Sign* for the future, though the *seventh day in course from the first Creation* were either not observed at all, or long since forgotten? Like which is that *Rep. p. 2.* *If I do not know which is the first or seventh day in course from the Creation, why should I write a Book for the Observation of a day which is impossible to be Known?* Indeed if I had writ a Book for the observation of the first day in course from the *Creation* (as you do for the *seventh-day* in course from thence) it had been something: but may not we know which is

the

the first day of Our week, without knowing which is so in a continual circulation of Weeks from the Creation? This, I suppose you take to be Wit (else we should not have it so often) and I will allow it so to be; (it is *εὐτεπνλία*, a fine turn of words to make them look as if there were somewhat of Argument in them when there is none; such as the Logicians call *Fallacies*;) Surely you cannot think there is any *strength of Reason*, in such arguings. And again to mention no more (though you oft talk at this rate) *Rep. p. 39. If I cannot tell which is the first or seventh day of the Week (from the first Creation) this (you say) overturns all my book.* No; not *my book*, but *yours*: because you reckon from thence, I do not. I am contented with what is the first day of our week. Or if we cannot tell *otherwise than by tradition* (which clause you think fit constantly to leave out) which is so from *Christ's time*: This tradition serves me well enough as to this point, (because we have no other way to know it; nor have you.) Yet I must not call this Trifling. (That, you say, is a hard word.) I wish the Reader do not think it *Trifling* to take notice of these *Witticisms*. I shall therefore let them pass.

But when I say, I am in this point content with Tradition (having no other way to know this matter of fact) pray do not suggest the next time, as if in every thing I content my self with uncertain dark speculations, and some uncertain Romish Traditions, *Rep. p. 36. 62. As p. 59, 60.* because I am content, to take the names of the week-days as I find them, I am represented as taking all as I find it, and taking all down without chewing.

Consonant to this doctrine (of permitting to the Jews, of what was not to be imposed on the Gentiles) is that of St. Paul to the Christian Romans; (Rom. 14.) many of whom, and perhaps the greatest part of them, seem to have been converted Jews (who thought themselves yet obliged to the *Mosaick Law*) others of them *Converted Gentiles* (who thought themselves under no such obligation:) Particularly in two things, difference of Meats, and difference of Days; (and it seems to be the same persons who were scrupulous as to both;) The Jew (who was not yet satisfied as to his Christian liberty,) made Conscience of Eating what by the *Mosaick Law* was *Unclean*; the Gentile not so, to whom that had not been a Law: One believeth that he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eateth herbs: 'Twas a weakness even in the Jew, yet was permitted, though not to be imposed. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth.

eth. And so of Days; One man esteemeth one day above another, (which I think to be meant of the Jewish Sabbath, though I suppose you do not,) another esteemeth every day alike. And the reason why I think it to be meant of the Jewish Sabbath, is because (as I have shewed before, *Disc. p. 55, 56, 57*, from *Deut. 16. 5, 6, 11, 15, 16.*) the other Feasts or Festivals (as that of the Pass over, of Pentecost, and of Booths,) were not to be observed out of the holy land, but at the Temple onely, and therefore of these there could be no doubt at Rome, because there was no occasion for them; but, of the Jewish Sabbath there was, even out of their land; and so, for the difference of Clean and Unclean meats. And therefore I take those days and those meats, to be the point in question. And what says St. Paul of these days? He that regards a day, regardeth it to the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it: Do you think this to be meant of worshipping the Sun upon Sunday? (as you would insinuate *Rep. p. 43. 45.* if it be meant of a weekly rest, you say, it is directed there, not to rest upon Sunday, which was observed by the Heathens in honour of the Sun.) Do you think that they who worshipped the Sun upon Sunday, did regard the day to the Lord? I think not; nor was the like permission to be allowed to such, as here the Apostle doth allow. He doth elsewhere forbid the eating of things offered to Idols; do you think he would allow them to worship the Sun upon Sunday; and not to be censured for so doing? It must be therefore meant of such Observance as was allowable, and of such a day for which there might be some pretense even to Christians (if Jews) and such as was to be observed out of their own land, and not confined to Jerusalem or the holy land. Which therefore I take to be meant of the Jewish Sabbath; which might be Observed, but not Imposed.

Which also answers All your Allegations, which you often insist on, of Paul's going into the Temple, and the Synagogue, on the Sabbath-day. For he might so as well on that, as on any other day; and he did so on other days and in other places, where he had the opportunity of a concourse of People; as I shewed you fully, *Disc. p. 50, 51, 52, 53, 54.* that I need not again repeat it. And 'tis so very little you have said against it, *Rep. p. 41, 42.* that I think it needs no further Answer.

Much to the same purpose is his doctrine to the Galatians; save that here he seems much warmer. He calls it preaching another Gospel, and perverting the Gospel of Christ, and doth anathematize, or pronounce them accursed who shall so do, *Gal. 1. 6, 7, 8, 9.* and wish-

wiltheth those cut off, who trouble them, Chap. 5. 12. by endeavouring to bring the Gentiles, under the Mosaic Law. He was contented to indulge the Jews as to their own practice, (which was the case of the Jews at Rome;) but when they would not be contented therewith, but would bring it as a yoke upon the Gentiles also, he will by no means admit it. For though the Blessing of Abraham were to come upon the Gentiles, Chap. 3. 14. yet not the Sign or mark of Distinction; there being now no difference between the Circumcision and the Uncircumcision, the Jew and the Greek; which he repeats three times in this short Epistle to the Galatians, Chap. 3. 28. Chap. 5. 6. Ch. 6. 15. And that this is the main business of this Epistle (to arm them against those who would bring in Circumcision and the Mosaic Law) is so obvious that none who reads the Epistle, with attention, can doubt of it. Nor can it be thought that it was the Gentiles interest thus to introduce the Law, but the Jews and Judaizing Christians; who would constrain them to be circumcised, that they might glory in their flesh, Chap. 6. 12, 13. Where though Circumcision be mentioned as the chief Badge; yet this was to make them debtors to the whole Law, and obnoxious to it, Chap. 5. 3. And amongst those beggarly elements, whereunto they desire to be in bondage, this is reckoned as one great instance, ye observe days and months and times and years; for which he says I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain, Chap. 4. 9; 10. 11. In that to the Romans he speaks but of a day, which was there in question, (which I take to be the Jewish Sabbath, as contradistinct from the Lords-day;) here he puts in days and weeks and months and years; not as if (in Galatia) there were occasion for those other times (out of the holy land;) but because there was the same reason of all the Mosaic times: And if this day (of which then the doubt might be) were thus to be brought upon the Gentiles, they might by the same reason bring upon them all the rest; for I testify saith he to every man who is circumcised (and thereby put under part of that Law) that he is debtour to the whole Law; and he that subjects himself to one of those days, is equally obnoxious to all those days and weeks and months and years. And if this (of the seventh day from the first raining of Manna in contradistinction to the Lords-day) were one of those, this (though not particularly named) comes under that general.

What you object to this (beside that the Jewish Sabbath is not particularly named) is, that these beggarly Rudiments or Elements of the World, is to be understood of the Heathen World, and of the Heathenish instructions, while they were Children, and particularly

of Sunday, which you tell us so often (though I do not believe it) was by the Heathens observed in honour of the Sun; And that to you it seems most likely, and scarce to be doubted, that one of those days blamed by Paul, and the principal one, was Sunday, which the Heathens observed, who knew not God, &c. Rep. p. 42, 43, 44. But pray, look again, and you will find these Elements of the World, were not Heathenish Elements, but Jewish Elements, under which they had been subject, but now were free; as now no longer under a School-master, as before they had been, Gal. 3. 24, 25. as the Hen, who while a Child differs nothing from a Servant, though he be Lord of all, but is under Tutors and Governours till the time appointed by his Father: Even so we, when we were children, were under the Elements of the World; but when the fullness of time was come (the time appointed by the Father) God sent his Son --- to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of Sons; (that is, as Sons now at age, and not, as in our Non-age, little differing from Servants,) Chap. 4. 2, 3, 4, 5. Do you think St. Paul, when a Child, was under those Heathenish Elements of worshipping the Sun upon Sunday? I thought Paul had been of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, (and these, you there tell us, were not of those who knew not God, but did service to those who by nature are not Gods;) that he had been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, that according to the strictest way of their Religion he lived a Pharisee, and was, as to the law blameless. 'Twas not therefore Heathenish Elements and Heathenish days; but Jewish Elements, and Jewish days; and if this from the first raining of Manna (as contradistinguished from the Lords-day) were such; this comes within that number. He says indeed ver. 8. Ye (Galatians) when he knew not God, did service to them which by nature were not Gods; But is there no difference between Ye and We? 'Tis We (saith Paul) were in bondage under the Elements of the World; But 'tis Ye (not We) who knew not God, &c.

A third place which I alleged to this purpose (and which is commonly so alleged) is Col. 2. 16. Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day (or festival) or of the New-moon, or of the Sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come. Here Sabbath is expressly named (which takes off your exception, that, in the other place, it is not) and in contradistinction to other Festivals, and New-moons. And this you acknowledge (Rep. p. 44.) seems to be at least a colourable objection, (the most colourable objection that you know.) Let us see how you can avoid it.

The Saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse, seem (you say) to be converted Heathens, and I suppose many of them were so, but there were it seems, amongst them, some Judaizing Christians. And Paul warns them (you say) to beware lest any man spoil them through Philosophy and vain Deceit; which you take to be Platonick Heathen Philosophy; but I take it rather to be the Jewish Philosophy, or the doctrine of the Jews; because of the words that next follow, *after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the World, and not after Christ*. Which I take to be a contradistinction of the Jewish doctrine, to the Christian doctrine; and I so think because all the particulars there mentioned (*meats, drinks, Festivals, New-moons, Sabbaths*, ver. 16.) were Jewish Traditions: And such are those rudiments of the world, ver. 20, 21. *Touch not, taste not, handle not*. And at ver. 11. the Circumcision of Christ made without hands, is put in opposition to the Jewish Circumcision (which was no part of Heathenish Worship) in room of which we have Baptism, ver. 12. and all this in pursuance of Christ's blotting out the hand-writing of Ordinances ver. 15. and nailing it to his Cross; meaning the Mosaick Ceremonial Law; Christ being the Body of which those were but the shadows, v. 17. In all which I see no mention of the Philosophical Heathenish world, but of the Jewish only. And though the Heathens had also some Festivals, I do not remember that I have any where found that their Festivals were wont to be called Sabbaths. You take, the Rudiments and Elements of the World, to be the rudiments or first teaching of the Heathenish World; but 'tis plain to be meant of the Jewish World (as I shewed you but now from Gal. 4. 3.) those Rudiments or Elements under which Paul was, before the fullness of time was come; which were (not the Heathenish, but) Jewish Elements. And that you may not think it strange that the Jewish doctrine should be called the Jewish Philosophy; you may consider that the name of Philosophy was wont to be applied to the several sorts of doctrines or ways of teaching or wisdom of several sects or nations wherein they differed from one another, (as the Philosophy of Zeno, Plato, Aristotle, the Greeks, the Romans, and so the Jews or Hebrews.) And thus Clemens Alexandrinus in his *Stromata* distinguisheth the Philosophy of the Greeks, from the φιλοσοφία τῶν βαρβάρων the Philosophy of the Barbarians, meaning that of the Jews, from whose Philosophy he shews the Greeks had borrowed much of their Learning. As before I shewed you Disc. p. 55. So that to me it seems clear to be meant, not of any Heathen Philosophy, but the Philosophy, Wisdom, or Learning of the Jews, the Jewish

Jewish Doctrine as contradistinguished to that of Christ.

You tell us Rep. p. 48. that beside the seventh-day Sabbath the Jews had at least three Festivals or Sabbaths; The feast At the Pass-over, Lev. 23. 4, 5. The feast of Pentecost, fifty days after the Pass-over, ver. 15, 16. (But that's a mistake, not fifty days after the Pass-over, but fifty days after the Wave-offering,) which two are indeed called Festivals, (in the place by you cited) but not Sabbaths: And the Sabbath of years, Lev. 25. 4, 9, 10. But all these (whether Sabbaths or not Sabbaths) are confined to the Holy land, Deut. 16. 5, 6, 11, 15, 16. Lev. 25. 2. wherein the Colossians were not concerned (for Colosse was far enough off from the Holy land) and therefore not likely that any of these are the Sabbath here meant but some other Sabbath, to which they might pretend at Colosse: And what could that be but the Jews seventh-day Sabbath?

Your former Exception (because of σάββατα here used in the plural number) that σάββατα in the plural number doth never signify the Sabbath-day, but only σάββατον in the singular; you now find to be a mistake, and own that σάββατα in the plural number is sometimes used for one Sabbath-day. But I am to inform you further that σάββατα in the plural number, is not once or twice, but most frequently so used by the Septuagints (in their Greek Translation of the Old Testament, especially of the five Books of Moses) whole Language the New Testament doth use to follow. You know that in divers Languages there be many words which as to the form be Plurals, but in signification Singulars. Thus Nuptiæ, though in the plural number, signifies but One Marriage, and Nundinæ One Fair, and Athenæ One Athens; so Calendæ is but one day (Dies Calendarum,) and Nonæ is dies nonarum, and Idus is dies iduum: And tertio Calendas seu Calendarum, is tertio die ante Calendas seu diem Calendarum. And such is σάββατα for One Sabbath-day, dies Sabbatorum. So in the Fourth Commandment Exod. 20. 8. μνήσθητι τὴν ἡμέραν ᾧ σάββατον, Remember the Sabbath-day (diem Sabbatorum) to keep it holy. And ver. 10. ἡμέρα τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατα κυρίου, the seventh day is the Sabbath (Sabbatha) of the Lord thy God. And Deut. 5. 12. φύλαξτε ἡμέραν ᾧ σάββατον, keep the Sabbath day (diem Sabbatorum) to sanctify it; and ver. 14. τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατα κυρίου, but the seventh day is (Sabbata) the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Exod. 16. 23. σάββατον αὔριον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου αὔριον, to-morrow is the sabbath (Sabbatha) a only rest to the Lord, and ver. 26. τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατα, on the seventh day is the sabbath (Sabbata.) Exod. 31. 13. τὸ σάββατόν μου σημεῖόν ἐστι, my Sabbath (Sabbata) it is a sign between me and

and you, and ver. 14. *ἐν ἡμέρῃ σάββατον ἐν ᾧ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἔργον, ὑμεῖς οὖν τηρεῖτε τὸ σάββατον* *shall keep my sabbath, (σάββατον) for it is holy unto you;* in which two verses *σάββατον* in the plural agrees with *ἐμεῖς* and *ἐν* in the singular (as before it did with *ἀνθρώποις*) because, though in the plural number, it signifies but *One* day; and again ver. 15. *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατον, ἡμέραν ἀγιασμένην, ἥτις ἡμέρα τῷ κυρίῳ* *bath (Sabbata) a holy rest unto the Lord;* and ver. 16, 17. *τοὶ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τηροῦν τὸ σάββατον ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὁ κύριος πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐμὸν καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐμὸν καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐμὸν καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ* *dren of Israel shall keep the Sabbath (τὸ σάββατον) it is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever.* Where, in five verses together, *Sabbata* in the plural, is coupled with a word singular. And (beside the places already mentioned) *ἡμέρα τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατον* *the day of the Sabbath (dies Sabbatorum)* and *ἡμέρα τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατον* *on the seventh day the Sabbath (Sabbata) and ἐπεὶ σάββατον* *the morrow of the Sabbath (Sabbatorum)* and the like, comes very often; where *σάββατον* is notoriously put for *one day*, *Exod. 35. 3. Levit. 16. 31. Lev. 23. 3, 15, 38. Lev. 24. 8. Num. 15. 32. Num. 28. 9. Deut. 5. 15.* And particularly 'tis *ἡμέρα τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατον* *(the day of Sabbaths or rests)* *Exod. 20. 8. Exod. 35. 3. Levit. 24. 8. Num. 15. 32. Num. 28. 9. Deut. 5. 12. Deut. 5. 15. Jer. 17. 21. Jer. 17. 22. Jer. 17. 24. Jer. 17. 27. Ezek. 46. 1. Ezek. 46. 5. Ezek. 46. 12.* and, in the New Testament *Act. 13. 14.* (and in how many more places I do not at present remember,) where 'tis manifest that the day of the Sabbaths (*σάββατον*) is *one day*. And if these be not enough, I can easily furnish you with more. For in all the five Books of Moses, we shall hardly meet with *σάββατον* in the singular number, but *σάββατα* in the plural. I shall not deny but that it may be found in some other Books of the Old Testament, (for I do not take them to be all translated by the same hand, or in the same stile.) But 'tis manifest, from the places alledged, that *σάββατα* in the plural number is wont to be used as a *Proper name* for *one Sabbath-day*. In *Kings* and *Chronicles*, *σάββατον* is sometimes used, and in *Nehemiah* pretty often in the singular number; but very seldom any where else. But whether it be *σάββατον* or *σάββατα*, in the Translation; it answers to the Hebrew *Sabbath* in the singular number; unless (very rarely) where in the Hebrew is *Sabbethoth* speaking of more *Sabbath-days* than one. And like as *ἐξουσία* and *ἐξουσίαι* do indifferently signify *Heaven*, so *σάββατον* and *σάββατα* indifferently signify the *Sabbath-day*. And in the New Testament, (which commonly follows the Language of the Septuagints) though it be sometimes called *σάββατον*, it is very often *σάββατα*, and ἡ *ἡμέρα τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατον*, and so I take it to be here meant *Col. 2. 16. ἡ σάββατον or of the Sabbath.*

*Sabbath* (whether *day* or *days* be supplied, I think is much one; for the Original hath neither;) *Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, ἢ ἐν μέλει ἐσθίης ἢ ποτίας ἢ σάββατον, or in respect of a Festival or New-moon or Sabbath;* that is, I take it, *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ σάββατον*, as we find it commonly worded, not *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ σάββατον*, which I think is nowhere found in Scripture.

And (as here) so in divers other places *Feast, New-moon* and *Sabbath* we find mentioned as in the same equipage, *2 Kin. 4. 23. Wherefore wilt thou go to him to day? it is neither New-moon nor Sabbath. 1 Chr. 23. 31. In the Sabbaths, on the New-moon and on the set Feasts. 2 Chr. 2. 4. For the burnt-offerings, on the Sabbaths, and on the New-moons, and on the solemn Feasts. 2 Chr. 31. 3. Burnt-offerings for the Sabbaths and for the New-moons and for the set Feasts. Nehem. 10. 33. Burnt-offerings of the Sabbaths, and of the New-moons, for the set Feasts. Hail. 1. 13, 14. The New-moons and Sabbath I cannot away with, your New-moons and your appointed Feasts my soul hateth. Ezek. 45. 17. In the Feasts and in the New-moons and in the Sabbaths. Ezek. 46. 3. In the Sabbaths and in the New-moons. Lam. 2. 6. The Lord hath caused the solemn Feasts and Sabbaths to be forgotten. Ezek. 46. 1. It shall be shut the six working days, but in the Sabbath it shall be opened, and in the day of the New-moon it shall be opened. Hos. 2. 11. I will cause all her mirth to cease, her Feast-days, her New-moons, and her Sabbaths. Amos 8. 5. When will the New-moon be gone that we may sell corn, and the Sabbath that we may set forth wheat? Now if in all these places, where Sabbaths are coupled with New-moons and Feasts, it be meant of the Jews *Seventh-day Sabbath*, why should it not be thought to be so meant here *Col. 2. 16. of the Feast, or of the New-moon, or of the Sabbath?* I add but one place more, which *Eng. p. 27.* you thus cite, (as referring to Gospel-times,) *It shall come to pass that from one Sabbath to another shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith Jehovah, Isai. 66. 23, 24. And, with this, you say, that great Gospel-Propbet concludes his Prophecy: which you should have cited thus, From one New-moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, &c.* which therefore sayes no more of the Sabbath than of the New-moon. And why those words a *Feast or New-moon or Sabbath* should not be thought to signify the same in *Col. 2. 16.* as the same words *Feasts, New-moons and Sabbaths*, do signify in *Ezek. 45. 17. 1 Chr. 23. 31. 2 Chr. 2. 4. 2 Chr. 31. 3. Nehem. 10. 33. Hos. 2. 11.* (and the other places cited) I see no reason. And if the words *Feast* and *New-moon* signify the same here as there, why should not also *Sabbath* be thought here to signify as there it doth? All which is not said in derogation of the*

the *Weekly Sabbath* indefinitely, but of that *Jews Weekly Sabbath*, in Contradistinction to the *Lords day*. Which I am fain to mention so often (in defense of my self and others) because where you find any to mention that the *Weekly Sabbath* or *Seventh-day Sabbath* (meaning that of the *Fourth Commandment*) is not here abolished; you presently catch at it as if they spoke it of *this Seventh-day Sabbath*; (that of the *Jews* from the first raining of Manna;) whereas you know, that even those who thus speak, do constantly maintain, that the *Jews Seventh-day Sabbath* was exchanged for the *Lords-day*, which is a *Weekly Sabbath* as well as that of the *Jews*.

You have yet another Exception, whereby you hope to elude this place; (leaving no stone unturned, to baffle it if you can;) Repl. p. 45, 47, 48. that *σάββατον* in the plural number is in the *New Testament* sometime understood of the Sabbath, and sometime of the Week; and to you it seems it ought rather to be here rendered *Weeks*. 'Tis well you said *σάββατον* (not *σάββατα*) for you had no pretence, as to any other Case but the Genitive. But I do not find that either here, or any where else, either in the singular or the plural number, either in the Genitive or any other Case, it signifies *week* or *weeks*. The only pretense (that I know of) why you so think, is, because *μία σάββατον*, is commonly rendered *the first day of the week*; as if you thought *μία* to signify *first* and *σάββατον* *week*. (And some others, not well attending the Greek construction, are apt so to take it.) But it is a mistake (as I told you the last time, and have here again told you more than once.) For this is not a literal translation (word for word) but onely as to the sense (*phrase for phrase*) such as when *μὴ γένοιτο* (Rom. 3. 4, 6. Rom. 8. 2, 15, and elsewhere) is translated *God forbid*; not as if *μὴ* signified *God*, and *γένοιτο* *forbid*; but because in Greek *μὴ γένοιτο* (*be it not*), answers to our English phrase *God forbid*; for what we Reject with some Abhorrence. So 2 Joh. 10, 11. *χάρις μὴ ἴδωται*, *Bid him not God speed*. Thus *μία σάββατον* (that is *μία ἡμέρα ἔκ τῃ σάββατον*) one day after the Sabbath, answers to our English phrase *the first day of the week*. And so Luk. 18. 12. *νυκθὺς ἁπὸ τοῦ σάββατου* (that is *ἁπὸ τοῦ σάββατου*) from the Sabbath (or after each Sabbath) *I fast twice* (before the next Sabbath) which is the same in sense with our English phrase, *I fast twice in the week*. Not as if it were rendered word for word, but sense for sense; otherwise, if *σάββατον* had signified *week*, it should have been *ἁπὸ τοῦ σάββατου* (that is, *ἁπὸ τοῦ σάββατου*) not *ἁπὸ τοῦ σάββατου* as here it is. 'Tis your mistake therefore to think that either

*σάββατον* or *σάββατα* doth of it self signify *week* or *weeks*, here or any where else. And this I told you the last time, though you do not think fit to take notice of it, or regard it; nor do you now bring any thing to take off that Answer. And, beside these Two Instances (which are clearly solved by the Ellipsis of the Preposition *ἀπὸ*) I do not know a Third, where either *σάββατον* or *σάββατα* is suspected to signify *Week*; and, no where, *Weeks*. And if *σάββατον* in the plural number always signify either *Weeks* or *Sabbaths*; it will make against, not for you; As at Mat. 28. 1. *ἔκ τῃ σάββατον, τὸ ἐνδοχρὸν οὗς μὴ σάββατον*, at the end of the sabbath, when the next day after the sabbath was drawing on, so I understand it; but if (because 'tis the plural number; which, you say, doth ordinarily signify more than one) you will have it, when *Weeks* were at an end, or when *Sabbaths* were at an end; your work is at an end: For if there must be no more *Weeks*, or no more *Sabbaths*, what will become of your *Seventh-day Sabbath*? But if you would have it, when the *Seventh-day Sabbaths* were at an end, and the *First-day Sabbath* coming on; this makes for the Doctor, not against the Doctor, as you would have it Repl. p. 47. I add further, if the *Sabbaths* Col. 2. 16. do mean the *First day* i. e. *Sunday*, (as you there suggest,) why do you tell us (Engl. p. 28.) that, in the *Old and New Testament*, the *First day* is never called *Sabbath*? And in *Levit. 23. 11, 14.* both the day of the wave-offering, and the day of Pentecost (which, Repl. p. 46. you would have to be a Sabbath, though I do not find it there so called) were both of them to be on the *the morrow after the Sabbath*, which I take to be the *first day of the week*.

And yet further; If these *Ceremonial Sabbaths* of the *Jews*, (for you do not pretend to shew that the *Heathenish* days were ever called *Sabbaths*) be the Sabbath (day or days) here intended; the word *σάββατον* might have been left out, and the word *ἑορτή* would as well have served without it. For (whether *Sabbaths* or no) they are all *Festivals ἑορταί*, and so called (*Festivals of the Lord*) *Levit. 23. 2, 4, 6, 11, 15, 24, 27, 34, 37, 39, 41, 44.* And these are *Festivals (ἑορταί)* in contradistinction to the Sabbath, *ἢ τῇ σάββατον*, beside the Sabbath of the Lord, ver. 37, 38. For though the Sabbath also be a *Feast*, ver. 2, 3. yet it is somewhat more than those other Feasts, and therefore (in the place before us, Col. 2. 16.) 'tis mentioned by name, as distinct from the rest, *Let no man judge you in regard (ἑορτῆς ἢ νηστείας ἢ σάββατου)* of a Festival, or New-moon, or Sabbath. Whereof the Festival returned once a Year; the New-moon, once a Month; the Sabbath once a Week. Which therefore I take to be the *Jewish Sabbath* as contradistinguished to the *Lords day*;

For 'tis of the *Jewish Institutions*, (not the *Christian Institutions*) that he is here speaking: not of the *Lords day*, nor of the *Lords Supper*; though these be *Christian Feasts*, as were the *Jewish Sabbath* and *Passover Feasts* of the *Jews*. Which *Christian Festivals*, exclude those of the *Jews*, as *Baptism* excludes *Circumcision*, ver. 11, 12. Yet not so but that they were then *Permitted* to the *Jews* (though *not obliging*) but not to be *Imposed* upon the *Gentiles*.

Beside these places alleged, wherein is mention of *Days, Feasts, Sabbaths, &c.* The same exemption from these I take to be implied in all those other places, which lay *Jews* and *Gentiles* in common. *Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also*, Rom. 3. 29. *There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: For the same Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him*, Rom. 10. 12. *Are we better than they? No, in no wise*, Rom. 3. 9. *Cometh this blessedness upon the Circumcision only? or upon the Uncircumcision also? Yes, upon them also; ver. 29. For Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness; not when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision; that he might be the Father of all that believe, though they be not circumcised*, Rom. 4. 9, 10, 11. *Circumcision is nothing, and Uncircumcision is nothing*, 1 Cor. 7. 19. So Gal. 3. 28. Gal. 5. 6. Gal. 6. 15. and to the same purpose elsewhere. In which places, and others to the like purpose, though *Circumcision* be mentioned as the distinctive Character, yet it is intended as a comprehensive Word of the whole *Mosaic Law* so far as it was peculiar to the *Jews*, as appears *Act. 15. 1. Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses; And ver. 5. needful to circumcise them, and command them to keep the law of Moses. And ver. 24. must be circumcised and keep the Law. And Gal. 5. 3. he that is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law: And Chap. 6. 13. the Apostle complains of it, as incongruous, to press Circumcision, without an obligation to the whole Law; (for neither they who are circumcised keep the Law;) intimating a like obligation to both, and a like exemption from both. And therefore exhorts them to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and (after such freedom) not to be again intangled with the yoke of bondage, Chap. 5. 1. And, in like manner, those at Jerusalem, *Act. 15. (since that God say they, hath put no difference between us and them)* conclude not to put a yoke on the neck of the disciples, but only those necessary things (of which the Jewish Sabbath is none,) ver. 9, 10, 19, 20, 28, 29. And again *Act. 21. 20, 21, 24, 25. So that what was before peculiar to the Jews is declared to be not obliging to the**

the *Gentiles*; of which number I take this to be one, of determining their Sabbath, to the *Seventh day from the first raining of Manna*. And, consequently, we are not obliged (together with the *Lords day*) to observe the *Jewish Sabbath*.

I have now dispatch'd (and I think sufficiently) both parts of what I undertook: To justify our observation of the *Lords Day*; And that we are not obliged to the *Jewish Sabbath*. I shall now endeavour to satisfy you (if it may be) in what you most insist upon, for the continuance of the *Jewish Sabbath*, whether *with* or *without* the *Lords day*.

What you endeavour to maintain, is this; That from the beginning of the *World*, as ancient as the *Creation* (Rep. p. 8.) before the entrance of sin and the fall of man (Enq. p. 23. 75. Rep. p. 50.) our Lord Jesus Christ, our Mediator and Redeemer (Enq. p. 13, 64, 75, 77, 85, 86, 136, 137.) did observe, institute, bless and sanctify the seventh day (Enq. p. 23, 64.) and that this doth include the seventh day of every week afterwards in a continual succession or circulation of days and weeks (Enq. p. 27, 30, 35. Rep. p. 6, 7.) and no other weekly day (Enq. p. 23.) then or since consecrated or observed as holy, but the seventh day only (Rep. p. 7, 8.) and not only *A seventh day*, but *The seventh day* (in a continued course from the first creation) and no other day of the week; (Enq. p. 3, 46, 75.) so long as the *World* lasts (Enq. p. 23. Rep. p. 5, 7.) to *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews* (Enq. p. 23, 24, 25.) and this to begin always at *Sun-set* (Enq. p. 83. Rep. p. 68.) And that this was thenceforth observed continually, (Enq. p. 23, 24, 28.) even to this day (Enq. p. 39, 73.) and the memory thereof, that we may not be at a loss to know which is the day, transmitted continually from *Father* to *Son* (Rep. p. 10.) and this tradition never interrupted or forgotten, (Enq. p. 39.) either before or since our Saviours time, Enq. p. 39, 78, 93. Rep. p. 2, 3, 53.

But certainly there is much of this that we have no *Word* for; no *Express Command* recorded. 'Tis but your conjectures or obscure inferences which you build upon; while nothing will serve you in our case, but an *express command* recorded in the word. Enq. p. 4, 33, 42, 44, 48, 50. As I have already shewed in most of the particulars. And shall again instance in some of them.

When you tell us, the *Seventh-day Sabbath* is as ancient as the *creation*, (Rep. p. 8.) I suppose you will abate the first Six days, for there is no pretense of a Sabbath before the *Seventh*. And I suppose you will allow a precedence to the *Institution of Marriage*; for though in order of the Story, the *creation of Eve*, and giving her

in marriage to Adam, Gen. 2. be mentioned after that of God's resting on the seventh day, yet in order of Time it was before it: For 'tis sure that on the Sixth day, God had created Man, male and female, after his own image, Gen. 1. 27. and Blessed them, saying, *Be fruitful and multiply*, ver. 28. And the like of their Eating the forbidden fruit, Gen. 3. though mentioned afterward, might be before, for ought we know. And therefore when you tell us (*Eng. p. 23, 75, and Rep. p. 50.*) that it was *before the entrance of Sin and the fall of Adam*; 'tis more than you or I know, (there is no Word for it, nor is it so Written;) And (if that were material to our business) it may be literally true, *Man being in honour continued not*, or as the words are in the Original (*Psal. 49. 12.*) *Adam in honour, (lodged not, or) continued not a night; but became like the beast that perishes, (or became mortal.)* And 'tis likely enough that they might Sin the Sixth day (on which they were created;) For else (*Adam and Eve being created, not as in an estate of child-hood, but as at full-age; and, having received the Blessing of Increase and multiply*) if they had so continued one night, I see not why Cain (if the first-born) might not have been conceived in innocency (which I hardly think, as well for other reasons, as because it is not till after they were put out of Paradise, that 'tis said, *Adam knew his Wife Eve and she conceived*, Gen. 4. 1.) And if they had (as you suppose) celebrated the first Sabbath in Innocency, I see not why he should not then have duly eaten of the tree of Life, to live for ever, Gen. 2. 9. and Chap. 3. 22. which is thought to have been a Sacrament of their Confirmation in Innocency, and freedom from Death (to which, by eating of the other Tree, they became obnoxious, Gen. 2. 17. and Chap. 3. 11, 19.) But this not being our present business, I shall not insist upon it.

I could tell you also of some Grave Divines (if that were the way of disputation between you and me to quote Authorities) who read it (Gen. 2. 2.) And on the Seventh day God Perfected the work which he had made (for so *vajickal* signifies:) understanding it of Gods promise of Christ on that day (before which promise, the condition of man after the fall, was very imperfect as to his happiness,) and by Gods Blessing that day, they understand this great Blessing promised on that day. Perhaps you may have seen a noted Treatise to that purpose of Mr. Walker a grave Minister in London above three score years ago. And I have by me a Manuscript Treatise to the same purpose of Dr. Alting (*Jacobus Altingius*) a grave Divine and Professor at Groningen, in pursuance of Mr. Walker's notion, which he doth highly approve. But I list not to start new matter of

of dispute between you and me when there is no need of it. Onely I may mind you, how slight a matter you make (*Rep. p. 11.*) of Christs solemn Blessing his Disciples and their Assembly (*Job. 20. 19, 21.*) a first and second time, on the day of his Resurrection being the first day, while here you would (on the Seventh day) make it an Institution.

I might tell you also that the other word to Sanctify, doth not necessarily signify to Institute, but to celebrate, or keep holy. 'Tis the same word in the Hebrew, for Man's Sanctifying the Sabbath in the Fourth Commandment, *Exod. 20. 8. and Deut. 5. 12. (Remember the Sabbath day to sanctify it)* that is here used of God, (*he sanctified it.*) And the same word *Exod. 20.* of Man at ver. 8. and of God, ver. 11. *he blessed the Sabbath day and Sanctified it.* But sure the meaning is not, Remember to Institute the Sabbath day. So *Neb. 13. 22. to Sanctify the Sabbath day.* Jer. 17. 22, 24, 27. And 'twere endless to tell you how oft we are minded to Sanctify the Sabbath day; that is, to Celebrate or Keep holy, but not to Institute the Sabbath-day: So *Joel 2. 15, 16. Sanctify a Fast, call a Solemn Assembly, gather the People, &c.* that is, Celebrate, &c. Though in all these places it be the same word in the Original that is here. And if to Bless and Celebrate be here an Institution; why should it not be so when Christ did Bless and Celebrate the day of his Resurrection, with his Disciples. Mean while I am loth to extenuate or diminish the sense of the word here, but willing to allow its full force and emphasis: Onely to shew you how unkind you are to the Lords-day (which, with you, is worshipping the Sun upon Sunday) while you are so very zealous for the Jewish Sabbath, as those *Act. 21. 20. zealous of the law.* Yet I shall not call it, worshipping Saturn upon Saturday.

And when you make so great a business, and so often, with *A Seventh* and *The Seventh*; We call it *The seventh* as well as you. But the question is, *The Seventh from whence?* In *Exod. 16.* it is *The Seventh* in course from the first raining of Manna; In the Fourth Commandment, it is *The Seventh after six days of labour*: *The Lords-day* is *The Seventh* in course from the day of Christs Resurrection. 'Tis vain to think that where-ever we meet with *The Seventh-day* it must presently signify *The seventh* in course from the first Creation. On the Seventh day the Child died, *2 Sam. 12. 18.* Is this the Seventh from the creation? or from the raining of Manna? or after Six days of Labour? No. But the Seventh day of the Childs age and sickness. So the Seventh day, *Judg. 14. 15, 17, 18.* is the Seventh day of Sampsons feast: And *Josh. 6. 4, 15.* the Seventh day

day of their compassing the Walls of Jericho. So *Lev. 23. 8. in the Seventh day is a holy Convocation, ye shall do no servile work therein.* Is this the Seventh in course from the Creation? No. But the Seventh day of the *Paschal Feast*, or *Feast of Unleavened Bread*, whatever day of the Week it happen to be. And the like in the same Chapter, *Lev. 23. at ver. 24, 27, 30, 32, 35, 36, 39.* where the Seventh day doth not signify the Seventh in course from the first Creation, but some other Seventh day. And when *Eng. p. 26. from Ex. 24. 16. the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days, and the Seventh day he called unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud, You would have this to be on the Seventh day Sabbath:* 'Tis more than You or I know. 'Twas indeed the Seventh day after those Six on which the Cloud covered Mount Sinai, but it is not said it was the Sabbath-day, or the Seventh day of the Week, much less the Seventh in course from the first Creation; all this is but your Conjecture without Book. Now pray tell me, How I shall know that the seventh day (*Exod. 16. 26, 27, 30.*) from the first raining of Manna, is the seventh in course from the Creation, any more than that the seventh day of the Child's age is so? or the seventh day of Sampson's feast? or, the Seventh day of encompassing Jericho? You will say perhaps, Because 'tis said *Exod. 26. 13. To morrow [is] the rest of the Holy Sabbath;* and *ver. 25. to day [is] a Sabbath to the Lord,* and *ver. 26. the seventh day [which is] the Sabbath.* But this will not serve the turn; for the word [is] is not in the Original, but supplied by the Translators: *to morrow the rest; To day a Sabbath; The seventh day, the Sabbath;* that is, *is or is to be;* for the Original will indifferently bear either. And *ver. 29. See, for the Lord hath Given you the Sabbath* (as if there were now newly given) therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days. Like as *Levit. 23. 8. in the seventh [is] an holy Convocation, ye shall do no servile work; [or is to be:]* But this is indeed a Sabbath (no servile work to be done in it) and so you call it (*Rep. p. 48.*) and though it be The seventh day, yet not the seventh in course from the first Creation; but the Seventh day of the *Paschal feast* (on whatever day of the Week.) Yet in all these places it is in the Hebrew *Hasbeigni* (The Seventh) as well as here. So that The seventh, will do you no Service; Nor doth it hence appear that the Jewish Sabbath was on the Seventh in course from the first Creation.

However (you'll say) the seventh from the first Creation, was the day on which God rested. And no doubt but the seventh from the first Creation was the seventh from the first Creation; The Seventh day of the World, was, the Seventh day of the World; The Seventh

Seventh day of the Year, was, the Seventh day of the Year; The Seventh day of the Month, was, the Seventh day of the Month; and The Seventh day of the Week (if they did then reckon by Weeks) was The Seventh day of the Week; But whether or no they did then reckon by Weeks, is the point in question. That they did then reckon by Days, Months, and Years, we may learn from *Gen. 1. 14.* (which are plainly distinguished by the Motions of the Sun and Moon,) But no mention of Weeks, there nor any where else (that I can find) earlier than *Exod. 16.* after their coming out Egypt. Nor do the Sun and Moon so distinguish Weeks, as they do Days, Months and Years.

But suppose we, that God did (as no doubt he did) Celebrate or Signalize (by some eminent Act or great Blessing) this Seventh day of the Week, of the Month, of the Year, of the World; as for instance, by calling Adam and Eve to account for having Eaten of the Forbidden Fruit; and thereupon pronouncing a Sentence upon the Serpent, the Woman, the Man, and the Earth; and then closing all with the Blessed Promise of the Seed of the Woman; How doth it appear from hence that it is to be our Pattern? and, if a Pattern, whether as to the seventh day of the Week, or of the Month, or of the Year? 'Tis not said Man did Bless, Sanctify, or Celebrate that day; or that he was commanded so to do, or did celebrate any Sabbath before that of *Exod. 16.* from the first Raining of Manna. Or if Man also might be said (so far as he was therein concerned) to celebrate (not to institute) this one day (as Moses and Israel *Exod. 15.* did that of their passing through the Red-Sea, on whatever day that was; And Noah upon his coming out of the Ark, *Gen. 8. 20, 21.* when he also received a Promise that God would no more destroy the World with a Flood, when God gave the Rainbow as a token of this Covenant with him and with all Flesh, *Chap. 9. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.* And Deborah and Barak *Judg. 5.* upon the Destruction of Sisera.) It doth not, from hence, follow that this must therefore be observed weekly, to the End of the World. There was indeed in the Pass-over, an Annual memorial (not weekly) of the day on which they came out of Egypt; but not to the World's end.

You'll say perhaps God's resting is made a Pattern in the Fourth Commandment, not of an annual but a weekly Sabbath. Very well. But that doth not appear from hence (*Gen. 2.*) but from *Exod. 20.* after *Exod. 16.* and from thence 'tis owned a weekly Sabbath is to be observed, that as God after the six days of Creation did rest from Creating, so they after six days of labour should on the seventh keep Sabbath; which seven days were then (I suppose) to be reckoned from the

the first raining of Manna Exod. 16. And therefore I do agree (*Disc.* p. 3.) from *Gen. 2.* and *Exod. 20.* (jointly) a weekly Sabbath is well inferred *thenceforth*; but not from *Gen. 2.* (singly,) as you seem willing sometime to mis-take me. And therefore, whatever *Intimation* may be supposed from hence, here is no *express command* recorded (such as you demand for the Lords day;) it is not *expressly said* (as I then told you) that *All mankind must, for ever after, observe every seventh day, in every week of days, reckoned continually from the first Creation:* (these were my words *Disc.* p. 4.) To which your answer is (*Repl.* p. 6.) *The seventh day blessed and sanctified Gen. 2. 2, 3. doth include the seventh day of every week afterwards in a continual succession or circulation of days and weeks.* But how doth this from hence appear? unless we must take your word for it; (as *Enq.* p. 55.)

But then, why must this *Every where, begin just at Sun-set,* (for which you are so very positive)? Here is no such *Word* that I find, nor any mention of *Evening and Morning,* or of *darkness and light* on the *Seventh day.* I do not doubt but there was (as on other days) *light and darkness, morning and evening,* on this day also: But here's no notice taken of it, nor any *Emphasis* put upon it. You say, *This day was to begin as did the first day and all the rest,* (because you say so,) that is, you say, *at Sun-set.* But where is it written (and where should I read it) that the *First day* did begin at *Sun-set*? The *First day* did begin at the same moment as to all the world; and why then should not the *seventh*? but 'tis not *Sun-set* at the same moment, all the world over. You tell us (*Repl.* p. 67.) You know no place in the *Word* where it is said that every Sabbath afterward was to begin the same moment of time that the first Sabbath began in *Paradise.* (I suppose, you meant *sense,* when you so speak, though it be ill expressed.) I answer, Nor do I know any place in the *Word* where it is said, that every Sabbath afterward was to begin at *Sun-set.* You tell us, there also, on what part of the fourth day the *Sun* was created is not certainly revealed that you know, nor do I, (I add also, nor in what *Meridian,* whether that of *Paradise,* or some other,) and I have told you likewise, *Neither do we know at what time of the first day God said, Let there be light,* and therefore we do not know, how long it had been dark before the *Morning* began. And I now tell you further, We do not know on what part of the seventh day, God blessed and sanctified it. If you say, God sanctified it by his *Example* all the day: then you resolve this sanctification into *example,* (not a *Command*;) If you think it signifies some positive *Command*; at what time of the day was that? You'll say, He *Rested all the day,* and therefore, from the Begin-

Beginning of it at *Sun-set.* Whether it began at *Sun-set* or no, is the point in question. That he *Rested all the day,* I can allow you; but so he did on the *Eighth, Ninth and Tenth day:* That is, he rested from *Creating,* having finished that work on the *Sixth day.* But that day (you'll say perhaps,) is the *first* on which he did so rest, and in some part of that day he did further sanctify it. Now, that that *seventh* was the *first day* wherein he did not create, I grant you; but not the *first moment* wherein he did so rest. For that was on the *sixth day.* For the *Creation of Eve* was Gods last work of *Creation,* (at least, the last that we know of,) which was some while before the end of the sixth day, for he did, after that, bring her to Adam, and give her to be his wife, instituted *Marriage,* and gave them the *Nuptial Benediction, Be fruitful and multiply:* which was after that he *Rested from creating,* but before the end of the *Sixth day.* But at what hour of that *Sixth day* he so rested, we know not, so that we are not obliged to begin our Sabbath from the time of Gods not-creating, but rather of some positive *Acting;* which is not likely to have been at *Sun-set* (when *Night* and sleep was coming on) but rather by *Day-light* and time of *Action.* But, of this, we have said enough before. And, as to *Man's Celebration* of that day (if he did so celebrate it) by *Contemplating Gods infinite Excellency and his mighty works,* (*Repl.* p. 7.) this he did on the *Sixth day.* For, before the creation of *Eve,* God brought to Adam every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and every living creature, and Adam gave Names to them; (to each according to its nature, as is supposed,) and what he called them that was the name thereof, *Gen. 2. 19, 20.* So that his *Contemplation* thereof, began on the *sixth day,* and would have been (for ought we know) *Every days work,* had he continued in *Innocency;* for the *Six-days labour,* and the sweat of his brow, began not till after the fall, *Gen. 3. 17, 18, 19.* So that we are at a great loss (as to what you can shew us from this place) whether we are to keep a Sabbath, and when it is to begin.

You tell us (*Repl.* p. 6.) From that Sabbathizing here, the seventh day is called the Sabbath, *Exod. 20.* (I should have said, From Gods *Resting.*) But if it be so called *Exod. 20.* it is not so called *Gen. 2.* nor for 2500 Years after. For the first time we find the word Sabbath, is *Exod. 16. 23.* and then *ver. 25.* and again *ver. 26.* in all which places 'tis called a Sabbath (*shabbat*) not the Sabbath (*hashabbat*) as of a thing before known; but as a thing then given them; but when God had so given it them, it is then called (*ver. 29.*) *hashabbat* (the Sabbath,) For that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore

he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days. But we do not find that he had before given them on the Sixth day the bread of two days, nor that it was before called a Sabbath, or that he had, before, given them a Sabbath.

But 'tis called (you say) the Sabbath *Exod. 20. 9.* and throughout the Old and New Testament, from the Hebrew root *Shabath* (he kept Sabbath.) I will not quarrel with you for telling us that it is The Sabbath at *Exod. 20. 9.* because it is so in our English Translation. But it is not so in the Original Hebrew, but a Sabbath; And so in the parallel place *Deut. 5. 14.* the seventh day is Shabbat; not *Hafshabbat*; Much less is it so throughout the Old and New Testament. But whether a Sabbath, or the Sabbath; it is not so called from *Shabath*, to Sabbathise, or keep Sabbath; but from *Shabath*, to Rest. And in *Exod. 20. 11.* where this is cited, as an inducement to the Sabbath there commanded, *In six days the Lord made heaven and earth— and Rested the seventh day*, it is not *vajishboth* (from *shabath*) but *vajanach* (from *nuach*), which is a sufficient intimation that *vajishboth* in the other place is not to be taken in a forced sense for Sabbathising (as you would have it) but in its plain native signification in the same sense with *janach* for resting, ceasing, being quiet.

And if you had a mind to play the Critick (though, I doubt, your talent doth not ly that way) you might observe, that, according to the Analogy of the Hebrew Tongue, the Nouns are wont to be derived from the Verbs, and not the Verbs from the Nouns; and accordingly we are not to seek the sense of the Verb *shabath* (to rest) from the Noun Sabbath (as if derived from hence,) but, of the Noun Sabbath, from that of the Verb to Rest. (and your self do here own, that the Verb *shabath* is the Root.) I do not deny but that a Verb (in Hebrew) sometime (but rarely) may borrow (as at the rebound) a secondary signification (in some of its remoter Conjugations) from a Noun which had before been derived from it in its proper sense. But it's no way likely that *shabath*, in *Cal* (its first Conjugation) should borrow its signification from its derivative Noun *Shabbat*, which never came in use (that we know of) till 2500 Years after. In this sense of Resting, Ceasing, or words equivalent, the Verb *shabath* is constantly used; *Gen. 8. 22.* *While the earth remaineth, seed-time, and harvest, and cold, and heat, and summer, and winter, and day, and night, shall not Cease.* Would you read it, *Shall not keep Sabbath?* *Prov. 18. 18.* *The lot maketh contention to Cease.* Is this to Sabbathise? *Josh. 5. 12.* *The manna Ceased on the morrow.* *Prov. 22. 10.* *Cast out the scorner, and— strife and reproach shall Cease.* *Nehem. 4. 11.* *Our adversaries said, They shall not know, neither*

neither see, till we come in the midst amongst them, and slay them, and cause the work to Cease. *Nehem. 6. 3.* *Why should the work Cease?* *Hof. 1. 4.* *Yet a little while, and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu, and will cause to Cease the kingdom of the house of Israel.* *Lament. 5. 14, 15.* *The elders have Ceased from the gate, the young men from their musick; The joy of our heart is Ceased, our dance is turned into mourning.* *2 Chron. 16. 5.* *When Baasha heard it, he left off building Raamah, and let his work Cease.* *Exod. 12. 15.* *Ye shall put away (or cause to Cease) leaven out of your houses.* *Ezek. 34. 25.* *And I will cause evil beasts to Cease out of the land. (not to keep Sabbath.)* And if these places be not enough, I can furnish you with a great many more, where *shabath* doth certainly signify to rest or cease; not to Sabbathise or keep Sabbath. So that Gods Resting or Ceasing to Create, proves nothing as to the beginning of the Sabbath. For that Rest began before the end of the sixth day; and continued beyond the end of the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth day, and (for ought I know) till Now. And as for the other words *Blessed and sanctified it*, we do no more know on what time of the day that was, than at what time of the day God made the Sun, or said, Let there be light. Nor is it at all likely that it was in the Evening, when Night and sleep were coming on. And therefore if our rule must be to begin our sanctifying the Sabbath when the Lord began it (as *Repl. p. 61.*) we are yet to seek when that was.

Yet I am willing to think, and would be glad to see it proved, (for I am no enemy to a Weekly Sabbath,) that here might be a Sabbath appointed, to be thenceforth observed Weekly, however darkly insinuated. For I think somewhat less than an Express Command recorded may serve to intimate Gods pleasure, (though nothing less will serve you for the Lords day.) The great obstacle, is, That we have here no Command recorded, nor any mention of Mays here observing it, nor any footsteps of such Consequent Practise (or so much as the Name of Sabbath) for more than Two thousand five hundred Years after this time; and then accounted (not from the first Creation, but) from the first Raining of Manna. From whence I am apt to think that it was not so observed, or it was not necessary for us to know it. But I find that a strong and willing fancy (as your Language is *Repl. p. 38.*) make you think you see it; But I cannot see with those Spectacles. Let's see your Proof.

First (you say *Repl. p. 8.*) *On the seventh day God had ended his work which he had made, and he sabbatized on the seventh day from all his work.* *Gen. 2. 2.* All this I can allow, except the word Sabbathised,

for the reasons but now given. For the word there used signifies no more than to *Rest* or rather to *Cease*. If any where else such *Rest* do from other Circumstances of the place appear to be a *Sabbatical Rest*, this must be from those other *Circumstances*, not from the *Signification of the word*. Which signifies but barely to *Rest* (if so much) or rather to *Cease*. For so it is in all the places I cited, and in many more. And I did search with some diligence for a place where it might import a *Rest* (of *acquiescence*) but could not find it. (Perhaps you may.) I find such *acquiescence* intimated on the *sixth day*, and some before, *Gen. 1. 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31. God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very Good.* But I find it not so said on the *Seventh day*, but that he *Rested*, that is *Ceased* to create. But whatever that *Rest* was, it was *God's Rest* not *Man's*.

A second Evidence (you say) is the same repeated ver. 3. *God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which he had created and made.* Here it is (by your own citation) he *Rested* from his work (not in it,) that is, he *Ceased* so to work; But all this is but *One Resting*, though it be so said in two verses. And 'tis *God's Resting*, not *Man's*.

But, at this rate, you may so husband it as to make this serve for five or six Evidences. 1. On the *seventh day* God ended his work, ver. 2. that is, he *finished* or *perfected* his work, namely by adding this *Seventh day* to his *Work* of six days. 2. He *Rested*, or *Sabbatized*, on the *seventh day*. 3. God *blessed* the *seventh day*, ver. 3. 4. He *sanctified* it. 5. the same repeated, *Because in it he had rested from all his work.* Yet still it is but *one Resting*, and 'tis *from his work* which he had made; and 'tis *God's Resting*, not *Man's*. It is not said that *Man* rested from *all his work which he had made*. But 'tis *Man's Sabbatizing* that we are now inquiring for. If it had been said, (as in the case of the *Lords day*) *After eight days* God rested again, and, with *Adam and Eve*. It would have been a better proof than all that you bring.

A third Evidence, you say, is in the case of *Cain and Abel*, *Gen. 4. 3.* In process of time *Cain* brought an offering to the *Lord*; and ver. 4. *Abel* also brought his offering. Here is a precedent for *Sacrifice*; but what's this to a *Seventh-day Sabbath*? But here you tell us (*Eng. p. 23. Rep. p. 8.*) that In process of time, is, in the Hebrew *mikkatz jamim*, (you should have said, *jamim*, not *jamim*; for *jamim* signifies *Seas*, not *days*) at the cutting off of *days*, or the end of *days*, that is, it seems to you, at the end of the week; because after the *seventh day* they were to begin to reckon again. 1, 2, 3, &c. (that is, supposing them to reckon by weeks, which is the point in question.) But why not as well the end of the *Month*? (for then we begin to reckon again

1, 2, 3, &c. for the days of the next *Month*;) or, why not the *Year*? for then again we begin to reckon 1, 2, 3, for the days of the first *Month* of the next *Year*. And, that they did reckon by *Months*, and *Years*, we know; but not that they did then reckon by *Weeks* (before that of *Exod. 16.* from the *Raining of Manna*.) Mr. *Ainsworth* tells you, at the end of *days*, that is at the end of the *Year* (for that *days* indefinitely, doth often so signify, a *Year*; as you may there see at large if you please;) or else (as we translate it) in process of time. Which I take to be the plain meaning of it without any further Criticism. At the end of *days*, or after *days*, that is, after some *days*; (and so *Mark 2. 1. 81. ἕως, after days*, we translate after some *days*.) Or, after many *days*; for it was many *years*; for this story of *Cain and Abel*, was but a little before the *Birth of Seth*, *Gen. 4. 25.* which was when *Adam* was 130 years old, *Gen. 5. 3.* So *Judg. 14. 8.* (*mijamin*) after *days*, is rendered after a time (that is, some time after) *Sampson* returned to take her, &c. But if none can tell us of any other end of *days* at that time, this is a good Evidence, you say, that these Offerings were on the *Seventh-day Sabbath*. If that be all, I can tell you, The end of the *Month*, and the end of the *Year*, are the end of *Days*, as much as the end of the *Week*: and those we be sure of, this we are not. I doubt such Evidence would scarce be thought Good Evidence in *Westminster-hall*.

The fourth Evidence you tell us, *Repl. p. 9.* is from *Gen. 5. 22.* *Enoch* walked with *God* three hundred years. Well, what's this to a *Seventh-day Sabbath*? Is it said he kept a *Sabbath* three hundred years? No: But *Enoch* you say, was a *Prophet*, *Jude ver. 14, 15.* and prophesied of the *Lords* coming to execute judgment, and to convince all the *ungodly*. What's this to a *Seventh-day Sabbath*? How could *Enoch*, you say, convince others, if himself did not keep the *Sabbath*? But stay a while: The Text you cite doth not say that *Enoch* was to convince them, but he prophesied the *Lord* would come to convince them. And, of what were they to be convinced? of all their *ungodly deeds* and all their *hard speeches* against him (the *Lord*.) Here's nothing of a *Sabbath*. Could there be no *ungodly deeds* or *hard speeches* against the *Lord*, unless a *Sabbath* were then to be kept?

Another Evidence, had been (*Eng. p. 23.*) from *Gen. 13. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.* (as here you cite it *Rep. p. 10.*) where speaking of *Abram* and *Lot's* great number of cattle, it is said ver. 6. the land was not able to bear them that they might dwell together (*lashebeth*) for their substance was great, so that they could not (*lashebeth*) dwell together; that is, (you would have it) they could not *sabbatize* together. But this you are (upon second thoughts) contented to quit; because you

be now aware that *Isabebeth* is not formed from *Shabath* (to rest, or sabbatise as you would have it) but from *Jashaby* to Dwell. Therefore this gives us no further trouble.

The next Evidence (which is now the fifth) is from *Gen. 26. 48*. *Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws*: And therefore, you think, he kept a Sabbath. But that's the Question: whether to keep a Sabbath were then a Law. It was indeed a Law at *Exod. 16*. but this was long after Abraham's time. You say, 'tis said in *Exod. 16. 27, 28*. *How long will ye refuse to keep my commandments; and the commandment which I have then broke, was, that some of them on the Seventh day went out to gather Manna*. Which was a thing which God had newly forbidden. *Exod. 23. 25, 26*. But did God forbid Abraham to gather Manna on the seventh day? You tell us (*Repl. p. 9*) that Righteous Abel, was a person obedient to God in all things; and that Enoch walked with God; must we therefore conclude, that they were circumcised, because God was afterward angry with Moses *Exod. 4. 20*. for not circumcising the child? Yet such is your Argument: God was angry with those who would gather Manna on the seventh day (which God had then newly forbidden) therefore Abraham kept a Sabbath. As to what you say, *Repl. p. 11*. *If the Law Broken by the Israelites Exod. 16. were the seventh day Sabbath, (meaning the then Jewish Sabbath) then 'tis very likely, one of the Laws kept by Abraham, Gen. 26*. Not so; for this (concerning Manna) was given long after Abraham's time. You might as well argue, that *If the Law Broken by Moses, was that of Circumcision*; then 'tis very likely one of the Laws kept, by Righteous Abel. You say, *p. 11*. *The Dr. doth neither offer nor pretend that Abraham brake the Sabbath*: I answer, And the Lawyer doth not produce one Precedent that either He or any man else, did keep it, before that time; or that it was his Duty so to do. You should first make it evident that it was his duty; and that he knew it so to be, and that that day, before his time, was not irrecoverably Forgotten. For this you tell us that, *This being implanted in Adam, who was created in Gods image, it might be* (you should have proved that it was) taught down along from Adam in gracious Families from Father to Son, and so to Abraham. But, first, this being a Positive Law (not Natural) is not one of those which are presumed to be implanted in his Nature. You should next shew that this Law was given to him in Innocency, before he had (by the Fall) defaced Gods image in him. You should thirdly take notice that Tradition (from Father to Son) is what you are always inveighing against; as a thing of no Authority. You should fourthly consider that the

Law

Law of Marriage, was as old, if not older, than you can pretend that of the Sabbath to be (*Gen. 1. 27. and Gen. 2. 1, 2*.) the Purport of which was (you tell us) *They Two shall be one Flesh: not they three, four, or five*: must we thence conclude that Abraham did not go in to Hagar? The like of Jacob and many others. And do not yourself tell us that Polygamy prevailed from Lamech to Malachi? even on divers eminent in the Church? You should therefore bring some better Argument, than that they were good men, to prove that they did then observe a Sabbath. The Feast of Tabernacles was a part of Gods Instituted worship; and David was a Good man, a man after Gods own heart, except in the matter of Uriah; will it thence follow, that David kept the Feast of Tabernacles? No; for we are expressly told? *Neb. 8. 17* that from the days of Jeshua the son of Nun, to that day, it had not been done. We must therefore have better Evidence, than that Abraham was a good man, to prove that he kept the Sabbath. For it might, possibly, not be a duty, or it might possibly have been so neglected (as some time or other) as that the precise day might be forgotten; and, if so, it was past recovery.

The sixth Evidence (which is your last) you tell us *Repl. p. 11*. is from *Exod. 5. 5*. (on which you descant for three pages) which amounts to this: When Moses and Aaron had desired Pharaoh to let Israel go three days journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to the Lord, Pharaoh replies, *Why do you hinder the people from their work? the people are many, and you make them Rest from their burdens*; that is, say you, *you make them keep a Sabbath*; because *Shabbattem* (you make them rest or cease) is a derivative from the word *Shabath* (to rest, or cease) from whence the word Sabbath is also derived: which I think is very little to the purpose. If Moses and Aaron had desired Pharaoh, to excuse them from their work one day in seven; this would have looked like an Argument that they had intended hence forth to keep a Weekly Sabbath (not, that they had done it hitherto, which is the point in question) but whether just on such day (and no other) as should be the seventh in course continually from the first Creation, (which I doubt was not then known, nor is now,) would not even from hence appear. And that the word *Shabath* doth not signify to keep a Sabbath, but barely to rest, or cease, is sufficiently shewed already. If you lay an Emphasis on *Yishbhattem* (in the Conjugation *Hiphil*, as you tell us *Repl. p. 12*.) 'tis the same Verb, in the same Conjugation, *Prov. 18. 18*. *The Lox maketh contentions to cease* (not to keep Sabbath;) And so in *Nebem. 4. 11*. And *Hos. 1. 4*. And *2 Cor. 16. 5*. And *Exod. 12. 15*. And *Ezek. 34. 35*. before cited. And in many other places which I forbear to cite. So that this

this doth you no service at all. And as for your *It is not hard to say, and It is not over-hard to imagine*, (but 'tis hard to prove) that by keeping a Feast to the Lord, they meant a Sabbath; this is but what you are wont to call *dark Conjectures*; we have no Word for it. By three days journey in the wilderness, you think may be meant Mount Horeb (it may be so) which (you say) Geographers observe (without hinderance) was about three days journey, (but then, they, their wives, children, and cattle, must make great marches to get thither in three days; for it was at least three days journey before they got to the Red-sea, Num. 33. 5, 6, 7.) where (at Mount Horeb) the Law for the Sabbath (you say) was reinforced, (and it must be supposed, that Pharaoh knew this, which they did not then know themselves; else what doth this signify as to Pharaoh's Answer?) And even this (if it were to keep a Sabbath) refers onely to what they were afterward to do (and we own that after the Law at Horeb or Sinai, a Sabbath was to be kept) it says nothing as to the Time past (which is what you were to prove) that it had been thus kept continually (without interruption) from God's ceasing to create, hitherto, which you would prove from hence.

What you say Rep. p. 13. of a Sabbath observed Exod. 16. (from the first raining of Manna before the Law at Sinai; is nothing to the present purpose. That there was a Sabbath appointed from the first raining of Manna, is agreed; the question is, whether it were observed before that time.

I had suggested (Disc. p. 34.) another proof as to this point (for I am not so averse from that of the Weekly Sabbath being observed in that Interval, but that I would be glad to see it well proved) from Pharaoh's seven fat kine and seven lean ones, and the seven full ears and seven empty; from the clean Beasts and Fowls coming into the Ark by Sevens, Gen. 7. 2, 3. Gen. 8. 20. and from three distinct Intervals of Seven days distinctly noted, Gen. 7. 4, and 8. 10, 12. within the compass of one Year. Which I thought to be a better Argument (as to this matter of fact) than any you bring. To which your Reply is (Repl. p. 35.) You hope I will not oblige you, or any other, to believe I so think. (A very obliging Complement!) But I do think so, what ever you will be obliged to believe. For the frequent use of the number Seven in Scripture, doth (to me) represent that Number as more than ordinarly considerable; and those three distinct Intervals, of Seven days each, particularly noted within the compass of one Year, is that which (to me) seems the greatest Intimation of any which I meet with, of days then wont to be reckoned by Sevens; and though I do not take it to be a conclusive Argument,

yet is the best I meet with, for measuring their time by weeks. And I would not have you think the worse of it, for my suggesting it. As to that Expression of Nebuchadnezzar's being seven years at grass; 'tis a rough Expression (I was about to say rude) but 'tis your Expression, not mine; I gave you the words of Scripture, Dan. 4. 25, 32, 33. Nebuchadnezzar's being seven years turned out to the beasts of the field. But this Evidence is by you discarded, as none of yours; and therefore I press it no further.

Let us then sum up the Evidence as you lay it. The point in issue, is, Whether, after God's Ceasing from the work of Creation Gen. 2. 2, 3. before the appointing a Sabbath, upon the Raining of Manna, Exod. 16. they did, during that whole interval, all the while divide their time by Weeks, and on every seventh day of such Weeks (reckoned continually from that day of God's Ceasing to create) keep a Weekly Sabbath, and that the Sabbath afterward from the first raining of Manna, and that of the Fourth Commandment, was but a Continuation of that Sabbath, on such Seventh day in course from the first Creation, and no other. For which your Evidence is, That In process of time, or (as you will have it) at the end of days, that is (as I understand it) after some days, or many days (about 130 Years) Cain and Abel brought their offerings; which you take to be at the end, not of some Year, or Month, but at the end of some week (because this best suits your purpose) not of the next week (for Cain and Abel were not then born) but of some week about 130 years after. That Enoch (about 500 years after this) walked with God, and prophesied of the Lords coming to judgment, to convince all ungodly men of all their ungodly deeds and hard words against the Lord; and may be supposed (if such Sabbath were then a duty, and the day known) to have kept a Sabbath. That (about 12 or 13 hundred years after this) Abraham (a very good man) is said to have kept all Gods Commandments (notwithstanding that of Polygamy with Hagar) and therefore, 'tis hoped, (if such Sabbath were a duty and the day known to him,) might keep such Weekly Sabbath, on that day. And (about 430 years after this) when Moses and Aaron desired Pharaoh to let Israel go three days journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to the Lord; he says to them, You hinder their work, and make them cease from their burdens; and therefore you think they did then, and ever before that time, keep such Weekly Sabbath, and just upon that Seventh day in course from the first Creation. And I must leave it to the Jury, whether they will find all that upon this Evidence.

Now on the other hand (though I would be content it were so.)

Q

yet

yet it seems to me somewhat strange; if it were so constantly observed, and just upon that day and no other, that we neither find any *Command* for so doing *Gen. 2.* nor so much as the name of *Sabbath* there mentioned, nor any where else for more than 2500 years, nor any mention (in the whole history of that time) of any that kept it, nor of any blamed for not keeping it (which after that time was very frequent,) and that in all those long Discourses in the Book of *Job*, none of his Friends (amongst the many faults they charge him with) should ever think of charging him with a neglect of the *Sabbath* day: And that he, when he was so jealous of his Sons *Cursing God in their heart* in the midst of their Feastings, as that he did every day offer sacrifice on their behalf, should never blame them for such Feasting for *Seven days together*, without any *Sabbath* (for ought appears) intervening; nor take notice of the disaster that befel them as a hand of God upon them for such neglect of the *Sabbath*; nor any of his Friends suggest any such consideration: Which makes me doubtful, that such *Sabbath* had not been observed during that Interval, or had long before this time been neglected and the day forgotten.

But after *Israel* came out of *Egypt* it is agreed, that *God* gave them a *Sabbath*; (whether then new, or then renewed, I list not to dispute.) And, that then it was the *seventh day in course from the first raining of Manna*, I think is agreed also. Whether this from the first raining of *Manna*, be also the *seventh in course from the first Creation*, neither You nor I know, nor any Man else. We may think it is, or we think it is not, but we cannot know it: We have no *Word* for it; and you bring nothing to prove it but *dark Conjectures*. The word *Sanctify* doth not necessarily signify to *Institute*, but to *Celebrate*, and in the Fourth Commandment the same word (*Kiddesh*) and in the same *Conjugation*, is indifferently applied to *God* and to *Man* (*Exod. 20. 8.* 11.) but *Man* did not *Institute*. That *God* did *Bless* and *Sanctify*, that is, by some blessed *Act* he did specially *signalize* that *seventh day* (the *first day* on which he did not create,) is very clear; And so he did the *first day* of *Christ's Resurrection*; declaring mightily our Lord *Jesus Christ* to be the *Son of God* by the *Resurrection from the dead*, *Rom. 1. 4.* which day *Christ* did *Celebrate*, with his Disciples, *more than Once*; (and they often afterward;) which yet you will not allow to be an *Institution*. And what you urge, that (at *Exod. 16.*) we have no *Word* that the day was changed, you please your self with putting Two Questions into One (as oft you do) and then putting the Proof on the wrong side; That it was then (on the *Seventh day* from the first raining of *Manna*) you cannot deny; but

but whether so from the first *Creation* 'tis You are to prove. The Point is clear on Our side, the Doubt is on Yours. 'Tis you are to bring a *Word* to prove, that a day was before observed, and that it was the same.

You think it strange that I should take this (from the first raining of *Manna*) to be a new *Epocha* (or time to reckon from,) and not a continuation of the old. My Reason for it, is because I think that the *seventh in course from the first Creation*, had either not been observed at all, or had long before this time been forgotten. And I gave you this further Reason for it, because (*Saturday*) the day next before the Raining of *Manna*, seems not to have been a *Sabbath* (as it ought to have been if this were a continuation of a former course of *Sabbaths*) for, on that day, the *Quails* came up and covered the Camp, and they were not forbid to gather them, *Exod. 16. 8, 13.* but on (*Saturday*) the *seventh day* after, they are forbid to gather *Manna*, because it was the *Sabbath*, ver. 5; 22, 23, 25, 29. Which shews a manifest difference between those two *Saturday* days. And that they did actually gather the *Quails* that day, appears *Numb. 11. 31, 32.* where 'tis expressly said, *That they gathered Quails, all that day*, (that is, all the remainder of that day next before the raining of *Manna*,) and all that night, and all the next day.

That the *seventh day Sabbath* from the *Creation*, if at all observed at first, might in the space of 2500 years come to be neglected and forgotten, is not strange, if we consider that the *Pass-over* had so been from the days of *King Solomon* to *Hzekiah's* time; and the *Feast of Tabernacles*, from the days of *Jeshuah* the son of *Nun*, till the days of *Nebemiah*; and if this *seventh day* from the first *Creation* came once to be forgotten, it could not be restored again (without a *Miracle*) as those other Feasts might; and must therefore be thenceforth no more observed, or else from some new beginning. And that there might be such new Beginning (as from the first raining of *Manna*) is not strange, since we see the same as to the Beginning of the Year, *Exod. 12. 2.* *This month shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the Year to you.* At what Month they did before begin their Year, is not certain; but from thenceforth it was to begin at the Month *Abib* or *Nisan*. So neither is it certain on what day they did before begin their Week (if at all they had Weeks) but from thenceforth they were to begin it from the *seventh day* from the first raining of *Manna*, but from what part of that day, it is not said. 'Tis therefore incumbent on You to prove (if you can) that (notwithstanding these presumptions) a weekly *Sabbath* was before observed, and just upon that day, and that it did begin just at *Sunset*.

Your next Step, is, That this *Seventh-day Sabbath* of the *Jews*, was (before the entrance of Sin) given in *Paradise*, to all *Mankind*; and by *Christ* our *Mediator* and *Redeemer*: which you have not yet proved, as we shewed before. That it was not by all *Mankind* generally *Observed* (but by the *Jews* only, in their time,) I think you do agree. For that it was to be a *Distinctive Sign* you grant; and I think it was to distinguish those of *Israel* from other *Nations* (because it is expressly said, a *Sign between Me and the Children of Israel*, *Exod. 31. 17.*) You think it is, to distinguish *God's* people from others: But it comes much to one, for you tell us also, that *Israel* in *Egypt*, was the whole visible Church; so that *God's* people, and the people of the *Jews*, will be much the same. And therefore, I presume, you do not think that any other Nation, but the *Jews* and their *Proselytes* (*Jews* natural, or *Jews* naturalized) did observe the Jewish Sabbath. How could it else be a *Distinctive mark*.

And I do not find that any other Nation but the *Jews*, (nor they till after their coming out of *Egypt*) did keep any Sabbath at all, or so much as measure their time by *Weeks* (of seven days) for many Ages after this time, nor earlier (that I know of) than the times of Christianity, when the *Observation of the Lords day* did introduce that of *Weeks*, where Christianity was received. This I told you the last time *Disc. p. 5.* to which you make no Reply, but that *Mr. Chafy*, you think, is expressly for it, *Repl. p. 16.* (but you give us no proof either of his or your own.) But if *Mr. Chafy* did think so (without any proof) are you willing (in this Dispute) to be concluded by *Mr. Chafy's* Opinion? If not, why should I? If *Mr. Chafy's* Opinion, or the common Opinion (as sometimes you speak) are to conclude You and Me; this Dispute (of a *Saturday-Sabbath*) will be soon determined. But if it be *Mr. Chafy's* Opinion, then it is (I suppose) *Mr. Chafy's* Mistake. But the way of Argument between us two, is, What Word is there for it? and where is it so written? Yet I am herein so fair with you, that if you shew me any Author (sacred or prophane) older than Christianity, who tells us of any Nation (other than the *Jews*) who did (before *Christ's* time) measure their time by *Weeks* (of seven days) I will admit it (so far) as a competent Proof. There may perhaps be such (and therefore I shall not be peremptory in the Negative) But I do not remember that hitherto I have met any such. And when I made out his fair Offer at that time; it is not civil still to charge us (again and again) with *Worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*, without attempting to shew, that the *Heathens* (before *Christ*) did observe weeks at all.

I shall now tell you further, that as late as *Ovid* and *Augustus's* time,

time, their *Week* (if you will give me leave to call it a *Week*) was a week of eight days (not of Seven days) which is not to your purpose, but directly against it.

*Dr. Beverage* tells of such a *Week of Eight days* in *Augustus's* time at *Rome*; as appearing by a *Stone* there digged up, containing a *Roman Calendar*, to that purpose. And *Ovid* tells us the same in his *Fast. lib. 1. vers. 54.* very distinctly, of this amongst other days.

*Est quoq; qui Nono semper ab Orbe redit.*

There is (he says) a day which doth, in a continual circulation, on the Ninth day return again; meaning their *Nundina* or *Market day*. Which thence had its Name of *Nundina*, quasi *Novendina*, as *Vossius* (in his *Etymologicum*) and other Criticks observe. Whereas if they had distinguished their time into Weeks of seven days, no doubt but their Markets would return on the Eighth day (or, as we speak, on that day se'nnight,) the same day of the next Week. Of which if you desire to see more, you may consult a Large Volume of Commentators on *Ovid's* Works, printed at *Frankford* in the year 1601. in their Notes on this Verse of *Ovid*. Where we have this *Roman Calendar* at large; and therein the Eight days of their Week are designed by the Eight Letters *A B C D E F G H*, just as, in our Calendars, our Seven days are designed by the Seven Letters, *A B C D E F G*. And so from the beginning of the Calendar to the end, as is in ours. Which Calendar is there transcribed from *Paulus Manutius*, in whose Works it is to be seen also, (and, I think, more than once,) and (I am told) in other Authors also. 'Tis plain therefore, that so late as *Augustus*, the *Romans* did not distinguish their time into Weeks of seven days: Nor do I know of any People that did so, except the *Jews*.

And this leads me to another *Fansy* of yours, of worshipping the Sun upon Sunday; of which you seem very fond. For we are reproached with this *Sun-worship*, or worshipping the Sun upon Sunday, above forty times. And *Eng. p. 88.* you would have it thought to be so in *Job's* time, and the name of our Week-days so ancient. And tell us *Eng. p. 90.* a *Romantick Story* out of *Verstegan* (but without any proof of what he says) of our *Saxon Ancestors*: who yet were later than the beginning of Christianity; and therefore nothing to the purpose if his Story had been true. I had answered all this so fully, and shewed you the true Original of the Names of our Week-days, *Disc. p. 63, 64, 65, 66.* and that (for ought appears) they be later than *Christ's* time; that, if you had not been very fond of the *Fansy*, you would not again (as you do often in your Reply)

run Divisions upon it, without bringing any proof for it but Mr. Chaffy's authority, to which you refer us *Rep.* p. 55, 56, 57. But when you can shew any Writer (Heathen or Christian) older than Christianity, who mentions any of the *Week-days* by any of those Names, (or indeed who mention any *Weeks* of Seven days, other than those of the Jews;) it will be time to think further of it. The oldest *Heathen Author* that I can find to mention them, is *Dio Cassius*, who lived about 230 years after Christ's time; who tells us it was then a *New thing, unknown to the Ancient Greeks*. You ought therefore to have shewed, if you could, that some Author, older than Christianity, had somewhere used some of those Names. Which you have not done, and I believe cannot do. And therefore your whole Story of *worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*, more than upon other day of the week (if they had such weeks) or in contradistinction to other days, is I think, a *Groundless Fausy*, if not a *contumelious Reproach* on the *Christian Religion*.

I should now have done with this, but that I find myself here charged with what I can by no means admit.

You tell us *Repl.* p. 57. *The Original of those Names of Days the Dr. agrees to be from Heathenish Idols*. And p. 58. *The Names of the Days of the Week be Idolatrous, as the Dr. agrees*. And again, *If the Doctor will retain the old Idol Names without scruple, notwithstanding his own acknowledgment whence they are, you cannot help it*. And yet again, *so fond of holding fast the Idol Names of Days*.

Hold! hold! not too fast. Where doth the Doctor agree that the original of those Names is Idolatrous? or from Heathenish Idols? or any thing to that purpose? Surely the Reader may think, that the Doctor had said *some such thing*, or else you would not so confidently have said it of him. I challenge you to shew, if you can, any Saying of mine to that purpose. I had said *Disc.* p. 66. that they are *Preca-rious* and *assigned at pleasure*, (as having no firm foundation; that I know of, in Natural Philosophy, which is the utmost you can pretend to, as of mine: But do you think, all that is *Preca-rious* (in Natural Philosophy) or *Names imposed at pleasure*, to be therefore *Idolatrous*. Those who gave Names to you and Me, did *arbitrarily* give us our Names. They might have called You *John*, and Me *Thomas*, if they had so thought fit, (and then our Names would have been so, which now are otherwise.) But I hope there was nothing of *Idolatry* in the case.

You say, *The Sun and Moon, &c.* (from whence they are named) were *Heathenish Idols*. Hold there! *The Idols of the Heathen are silver and gold, the work of mens hands, (or perhaps of meaner materials.)* But the *Sun, Moon, and Stars*, are the good Creatures of

God

God, made for the benefit and use of Man. May we not Name the Sun and Moon because some *Heathens* have worshipped them? Sure we may. When any are so vain as to worship them, this doth not make them *Idols* (against the Second Commandment) but *false Gods* (against the First: ) 'tis rather *Polytheism* than *Idolatry* in strictness of Speech. 'Tis true that an *Image* of the Sun or Moon (if made to be worshipped) may become an *Idol*, (and so may an *Image* of God also,) but this doth not make the *Sun* and *Moon* to be *Idols*. The Sign of the *Sun*, the *Moon*, the *Star*, the *Seven Stars*, upon a Sign-Post in *London*, (which give names to the Shop or House where they hang,) I do not take to be *Idolatrous*: And I know not why they may not as well give names to a *Day*, as to a *House*. I know no more *Idolatry* in *Sunday*, than the *Sun-Tavern*, or *Mars-hill*.

We are expressly forbid (you say *Rep.* p. 58.) to mention the Names of *Idols*. But I do not take the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars* to be *Idols*; at least not such *Idols* as we may not name. Or, if so, why do You name them? And if the names of *Idols* may not at all be named by us; How is it that you tell us of *Baal* and *Molech*? *Enq.* p. 88, 89. and how is it that we come to hear of *Baalim*, and *Asteroth*, and *Milchom*, and *Remphan*? of *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Mercury*, *Diana*, *Castor* and *Pollux*, in the sacred Writers?

I desire you to forbear hereafter (without giving it any hard word) to say *The Doctor Agrees*, that the Original of these Names is *Idolatrous*. What you or others may think of it (who take down without chewing such a *Romantick Story*) I leave to them: But I do not agree, nor do I think it to be *Idolatrous*. And you might have known that I do not: I am sure you cannot know that I do. My words were plain, and full, (*Disc.* p. 66.) *Whether on each of these Days, they did worship those respective Planets, as so many Gods, I cannot say; nor do I think it*. I had told you very plainly (and you could hardly mistake me, except wilfully) from whence I thought these names were taken, and from whence they were not, *Disc.* p. 65, 66, 67. Not from the number of the *Heathen Gods* (as if they had been but *Seven*;) but from the number of the *Seven Planets*, (which I do not take to be *Gods*, but the good Creatures of God:) and not from a *Religious* but an *Harmonical* or *Astrological* account; and how they came to be so called, and in this order. And, of what *Antiquity*: Not older than Christianity. And therefore you do me wrong to say the Doctor agrees it to be *Idolatrous*. I said onely it was *Preca-rious* (not *idolatrous*.) But, it seems, if I grant an *Inch*, you'll take an *Ell*. Now whether this be *Art*, *Artifice*, or *Legerdemain*, (thus to Palm upon me,) whether *Imposing upon the Reader*, *Imposing upon all the World*, to

pre-

pre-possess and prejudice the Reader, a very ill Bleat, and highly blameable, or what other hard name to give it (out of your *copia verborum* or Academy of Complements) I shall leave it to the Reader. I am loth to call it Slander or Calumny; But I am sure it is not fair Practice.

I confess I might have spared saying so much, as that it was Pre-carious, if I had known what improvement would have been made of that word; I do usually Avoid delivering an Opinion, in cases by the by, which might suggest matter of dispute between us. But I find that, even so, I am not secure: For if I do not say what you would have me, then (as if you were drawing a Chancery-Bill) you will say it for me; and if then I do not expressly Deny it, you will take it for granted. Thus when, to that Objection, that *Christmas is of Humane Institution*, I had answered (*Disc. p. 13.*) *Be it so* (that is, If it be so, or Suppose it be so) *but the Pass-over was of Divine Institution; yet, &c.* Now because I had not told you, what I think of *Christmas*, you will tell me, (*Repl. p. 3.*) Where first you change my *Be it so*, into *So be it*, and then into *I admit it is so*: and then, *this lays aside all Holy-days of humane Institution*; as if I had said so. And the like very often. But I am not now answering a Chancery-Bill: and therefore I do not allow you to take my Silence to be Consent. As when (*Eng. p. 89.*) you suggest, as if a Divine might not wear a Black Gown (as well as a Barrister) without being reputed one of the (*Black-coat*) Chemarims, whom God threatens to cut off: I would not be thought of that Opinion, though I did let it pass without an Answer, as being nothing to the purpose of a Saturday-Sabbath.

But let me desire you (before we part) not as an Adversary, but as a Friend, not to be too lavish of your language in reproaching the Lords day; even what we take to be the Lords-day. It may be (for ought you know) what we call it. You know it hath been so thought by the Generality of Christians all along, and is so at this day. And though you may think your self herein Wiser than all Mankind, yet you may be mistaken: And (if so) then, Whose Day is it, and whose Worship, which you so oft reproach as *Worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*? 'Tis not suitable to that tenderness that you sometime profess, to venture so daringly upon that wherein, if you be mistaken, you be dangerously mistaken; and 'tis highly blameable (if I may use your own words) so to Venture. I can bear the reproaches you cast upon me all along, (without any just occasion for being so charged,) but I would not have you reproach the Lords day.

I have now done with your Reply, so far as I thought needful to take notice of it. Many things I have let pass, as not pertaining to this

this business. And perhaps even somewhat of this might have been spared. If in some particulars I have expressed my sense otherwise than some others before have done, *Veniam dabimus pretimusque vicissim*; and perhaps if some of them had before considered what now I write, they might have been of the same opinion. However, as to the main point in question, the Generality of Christians I take to be concurrent with me; and if in some particulars we differ, they have my Reasons for what I say.

I shall briefly summe up the chief points in dispute between you and me.

That Christ, as God, (in union with the Father and Holy-Ghost,) did create the World, I readily grant. But not singly (in contradiction to the Father and Holy-Ghost,) nor as our Mediator and Redeemer, (God and Man.) For it is the Man Christ Jesus, that is Mediator between God and Men: but he was not then Man. Nor was there any Occasion for a Redeemer, before the Fall of Adam: which was not till after the World was created. And I presume, when you consider of it, you do herein agree with me, whatever unwary expressions you might have let fall.

I agree also that God created the World in Six days; that is, that in every of those days he created somewhat; as is declared in Gen. i. But in what part of each day he did create each particular, we do not know; Nor, that he did imploy the whole day therein. (And in this, I think, you may agree with me also.) For the Creation of Eve was (for ought we know) Gods last work of Creation; which was certainly finished before the End of the Sixth day. For, after this, she was given as a Wife to Adam, with the Institution of Marriage, and the Nuptial Benediction, *Be fruitful and multiply*, on the Sixth day.

I agree also, that there was, on the First day, Darknes and Light, (and so on the Second, Third, and other days,) and that Darknes was before Light. But, how long it had been dark before God said *Let there be Light* (whether just twelve hours, neither more nor less) we cannot tell: Much less that every of these days did begin at Sun-set (before there was a Sun,) or what is equivalent to it, as you would have it. We have no Word for it, nor is it so Written. 'Tis but your Fancsy, or (as in your own language) nothing but dark conjectures (very dark) or at most, some uncertain Jewish Traditions, later than our Saviour's time. (for I think few of the Rabbins are so old;) And I do not know but that (since that time) Christians may understand the Bible as well as they. And sure we are, that both in the Old and New Testament, days are otherwise reckoned; the

Evening being accounted as belonging to the day *past*, not to the day to come on the morrow.

I agree also that God did on the *Seventh* day, *Rest* or *cease to Create*; that is, that the *Seventh* was the *first day* (though not the *first Moment*) in which he did *not create*.

I agree also that God did *Bless* and *Sanctify* the *Seventh* day; that is, that he did *Celebrate* or *Signalize* (by some *Holy* and *Blessed Act of Providence*) this *Seventh* day more than the *Eighth* or *Ninth* or those that follow (though in these also he *ceased* from *Creating*;) Perhaps by that *Blessed Promise* of the *Seed of the Woman* on this day. But, on *what part* of this day he did *begin* thus to *Bless* and *Sanctify* it, we cannot tell: Much less, that it was just at *Sun-set*. And, whatever it were, it doth not appear to have been *during the State of Innocence* (as you would have it, without alleging any thing to prove it) but might be (for ought appears) *after the Fall*. Nor is it said that *Adam and Eve* did *bless* or *sanctify* it, or that they were *commanded* so to do; much less that they were *commanded for ever after* to *sanctify every seventh day in course* from hence, and *no other*, to the *end of the World*; as you would have it. Nor do there appear any footsteps in history (sacred or profane) that any such *Sabbath* was observed, or the *name of Sabbath* ever used, before that of *Exod. 16.* after *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*. And whatever inducements we have so to think, are but *Conjectural*; we have no *Word* for it, nor is it so *Written*.

I do agree also, that after *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*, a weekly *Sabbath* was appointed, to them, on the *seventh* day in course from the *first raining of Manna*: But whether *this* (from the first raining of *Manna*) were also a *seventh in course* from the first *Creation*; we cannot tell: Nor are we sure that *this* course of *Sabbaths*, even to the *Jews*, did continue till *Christ's* time; but might (for ought we know) be interrupted and forgotten during the *Babylonish Captivity*, and after restored by *Nehemiah*, either on the *same* or some *other* day, and so continue till *Christ's* time: Nor do you think (as sometimes you tell us) that any *other* nation but the *Jews* (and their *Profelites*) did *then* observe *this* or any *other Sabbath*; nor (I think) earlier than the times of *Christianity*. I add, Nor doth it appear that any *other Nation* (before the times of *Christianity*) did measure their time by *Weeks* (of seven days) as they did by *Months* and *Years*; or that even the *Jews* so did before that of *Exod. 16.* Much less, that the names of *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, &c. were so much as *known* before that time; or that, even then, they were taken up upon an *Idolatrous* account (as you imagine) but only an *Astrological* account with respect to the *Seven Planets*. I

I agree also that in the *Fourth Commandment* on Mount *Sinai* a *weekly Sabbath* is appointed, on the *seventh* day after *six days of labour*: But that this must be (till the worlds end) just on the *seventh in course* from the first raining of *Manna* (as was that of the *Jews*,) or (as you would have it) the *seventh in course from the first Creation*, I do not find; but think our *Lords-day* doth as fully answer the *Words* and *Design* of the fourth *Commandment* as did, then, that of the *Jews*: and is as much specified by the *practise* and *appointment* of *Christ* and his *Apostles* and the *Christian Church*, (reckoned in course from *Christ's Resurrection*) as was that by *Moses* from the raining of *Manna*. (The fourth *Commandment* requires a *Day*; and the *Practise* of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, directs to *Which* day.) And I think we have as clear Evidence that our *Lords-day* is that in a continual succession from the *Lords-day* in the *New Testament* (on the *first day of the Jewish Week*) as you can have that our *Saturday* is in a continual succession from the *Jewish Sabbath* on their *seventh day*; and much more than that it is so in a continued succession from the first *Creation*.

And in every of the points wherein we differ, I think I have so fully answered all your *Objections* and *Allegations*, that no indifferent Reader will doubt of it.

And therefore, upon the whole matter, I see no reason why either You or We should neglect to *Celebrate the Lords-day*, or change it for your *Saturday-Sabbath*.

I have forborn giving you *hard words* (save as the Arguments may pinch hard) unless perhaps in returning your own words upon you. Which if they were *soft words* as coming from you, I hope you will not think them *hard* from me. Or if even therein you think I have been too severe, I beg your Pardon. But desire you withal to consider, that, when you Magisterially affirm so many things of which you give so little proof, and ly so open and obnoxious to Exceptions all along, *Difficile est Satyram non scribere*. My design in writing is to Assert the *Truth*, and Preserve the *Peace* of the Church, in a point which I think *Material*: And am sorry that therein I have You my Adversary. For I have no ill Will to your Person, though I cannot approve your Opinion. But am

S I R,

Your very Humble Servant,

JOHN WALLIS.

Sept. 3.  
1693.

And in every of the points wherein we differ, I think I have fully answered all your objections and allegations; that notwithstanding, I am not without doubts of it.

And therefore, upon the whole matter, I do not think myself obliged to you or We should neglect to Celebrate the Sabbath, or change it for your Sunday Sabbath.

I have forbore giving you back words (I fear as the Arguments may pinch hard) unless perhaps in returning your own words upon you. Which if they were set down as coming from you, I think you will not think them hard from me. Or is it even that you think I have been too severe, I beg your Pardon. But believe me, without to consider that, when you Magisterially affirm so many things of which you give so little proof, and yet so often and opposite to Exceptions all along. I think it is to blame the Lord, and not the man. My design in writing is to inform the Lord, and not to serve the man of the Church in a point which I think should be settled. And am sorry that therein I have not my Authority. For I have no Will to your Reason, though I cannot avoid your Opinion. But am

Yours

JOHN WALLIS.

1693

EDWARD ARBONSON  
 1693